United Nations A/ES-10/PV.16

General Assembly
Emergency Special Session

Official Records

16th meeting
Tuesday, 7 May 2002, 10.30 a.m.
New York

President: Mr. Han Seung-soo ..... (Republic of Korea)

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

The President: I declare the tenth emergency special session of the General Assembly resumed pursuant to Assembly resolution ES-10/9 of 20 December 2001, whereby the Assembly decided:

> "to adjourn the tenth emergency special session temporarily and to authorize the President of the General Assembly at its most recent session to resume its meeting upon request from Member States".

In this connection, I should like to draw the attention of the delegations to the following: document A/ES-10/170, which contains a letter dated 3 May 2002 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of the Sudan to the United Nations, in which he requested, on behalf of the States members of the League of Arab States, the resumption of the tenth emergency special session; and document A/ES-10/171, which contains a letter dated 3 May 2002 from the Permanent Representative of South Africa to the United Nations in his capacity as Chairman of the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement and by which he also requested the resumption of the tenth emergency special session.

In accordance with rule 63 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the President and Vice-Presidents of the fifty-sixth session will serve in the same capacity at the resumed tenth emergency special session.

May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to decide that the Credentials Committee of the fifty-sixth session should serve for the resumed tenth emergency special session?

It was so decided.

Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations (A/ES-10/172)

The President: In keeping with the established practice, I should now like to draw the attention of the General Assembly to document A/ES-10/172, which contains a letter addressed to me by the Secretary-General informing the Assembly that 21 Member States are in arrears in the payment of their financial contributions to the United Nations within the terms of Article 19 of the Charter.

May I take it that the General Assembly duly takes note of this information?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 5 *(continued)*

Illegal Israeli actions in occupied East Jerusalem and the rest of the Occupied Palestinian Territory

Draft resolution A/ES-10/L.9

The President: I give the floor to the representative of South Africa to introduce draft resolution A/ES-10/L.9.

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

02-37023 (E)

Mr. Kumalo (South Africa): We come before the General Assembly in response to the deadlock in the Security Council on how to deal with the Israeli army's incursions into Palestinian territory. Consequently, it is my honour on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement to introduce a draft resolution on Palestine on how the General Assembly can respond to the tragic situation in the Middle East.

The Security Council, which according to Article 24 of the United Nations Charter has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, did not take the necessary action on the question of Palestine.

Even more troubling is that recently, when the United Nations Secretary-General decided to send a fact-finding mission to the Jenin refugee camp to investigate events that occurred as a result of an invasion by the Israeli army, the Israeli Government prevented the fact-finding mission from entering Palestine. To this day, the Security Council has yet to react officially to this Israeli rejection.

In addition, the Israeli Government has refused to cooperate with the Commission on Human Rights fact-finding team led by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, Mary Robinson. Israel has also not given effect to the 5 December Final Declaration of the Conference of High Contracting Parties to the Fourth Geneva Convention.

The General Assembly must now stand against Israel's defiance of international humanitarian law and of human rights. The intransigence of the Israeli State is beginning to erode the credibility and legitimate standing of the United Nations as a whole. Israel seems to have developed a culture of acting with impunity when it comes to the United Nations. The message that must emanate from the Assembly must be that no individual Member of the United Nations can be treated differently from the rest.

The Security Council has adopted a number of important resolutions on Palestine. Two of those — 1402 (2002) and 1403 (2002) — call for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Palestinian territory without delay. However, Israel has yet to withdraw its forces from Palestine. Instead, the Israeli army has invaded more Palestinian towns.

Resolution 1405 (2002) welcomes the Secretary-General's initiative to send a fact-finding mission to investigate the events in Jenin. But after many days of prevarication and obstruction, Israel eventually forced the Secretary-General to disband his high-profile fact-finding team.

The problem is that the Security Council still does not seem to know what to do when the Israeli Government chooses to ignore the Council's authority. To people throughout the world, it makes little difference whether the Security Council has met virtually every day on Palestine or whether the Council authorized, mandated or merely welcomed the deployment of the fact-finding team.

The point is that the Security Council unanimously agreed that it was in the best interests of both parties — the Israelis and the Palestinians — and, indeed, of the entire international community that the truth behind the events in Jenin be established. The accusations, suspicions and controversy behind what actually happened in Jenin have not died down, nor are they likely to do so.

As the Secretary-General said in his letter to the President of the Security Council on the disbanding of the Jenin fact-finding team, dated 1 May 2002:

> "I regret being unable to provide the information requested by the Council in resolution 1405 (2002), and especially that the long shadow cast by recent events in the Jenin refugee camp will remain in the absence of such a fact-finding exercise." (*S/2002/504, p. 3*)

Through its own actions, the Israeli Government has led us to the perception that the truth is something it would wish to hide, but, as we all know, the truth will ultimately prevail.

The people of Palestine look to the General Assembly as their last recourse. Every member of the Assembly has the obligation to take a stand on the crisis in the Middle East. This is no time for moral ambivalence and double standards. The time has come to allow the wider international community to articulate its views and to send a clear and unambiguous message to the Government of Israel that international law and human rights are non-negotiable.

The draft resolution before the Assembly seeks to do precisely that. We wish to leave the Government of Israel in no doubt that its recent military incursions far exceeded the boundaries of the right to self-defence. Furthermore, we want it to be known that Israel's

actions cannot be justified on the grounds of counter-terrorism.

Combating terrorism does not license any State to disregard international law and humanitarian norms. There can be no valid comparison drawn between the fight against international terrorism and the fight against the legitimate struggle of the Palestinian people to end foreign occupation.

The draft resolution before the Assembly gives all members an opportunity to be on record on the situation in the Middle East. Besides condemning the Israeli army for brutal assaults on Palestinian cities, it points out that the refusal by Israel, the occupying Power, to cooperate with the Secretary-General's fact-finding team sent to the Jenin refugee camp is a violation of Security Council resolution 1405 (2002).

The resolution requests the Secretary-General to present a report drawing upon the available resources and information on the recent events that took place in Jenin and in other Palestinian cities. The resolution demands that Israel cease all hindrances and obstacles to the work of humanitarian organizations and United Nations agencies in the occupied Palestinian territories, in particular the International Committee of the Red Cross and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East.

Our presence in the General Assembly today attests to our belief that there can still be a peaceful resolution in the Middle East, even though the situation has become intractable. We believe that there can be no solution for peace in Palestine that will not include President Arafat, the democratically elected leader of the Palestinian people.

It is with that belief and in that spirit that we call on the members of the Assembly to give their resounding support to the draft resolution before us and to send a clear message that the United Nations is ready to take a stand on the issue of Palestine.

The President: I give the floor to the Permanent Observer of Palestine.

Mr. Al-Kidwa (Palestine) (*spoke in Arabic*): I should like at the outset to thank you, Mr. President, and the Permanent Representative of South Africa for introducing the important draft resolution before us today.

A serious crisis is gripping Palestine and the Middle East. There is a crisis also in the international order established by the Charter of the United Nations. I am not sure whether the first crisis has led to the second or vice versa — meaning that the state of stagnation prevailing in the Security Council could be responsible for having allowed the situation in Palestine and in the Middle East to deteriorate to the extent it has, and possibly could allow it to deteriorate even further.

The important thing is that, because of these two serious crises, we have called for the resumption of the tenth emergency special session of the General Assembly, in accordance with the "Uniting for Peace" formula and as a last resort, in the hope that the Member States will be able collectively to undertake what the Security Council has failed to do. What is required now is seriously to address the situation in Palestine and in the Middle East, and specifically to put an end to the bloody Israeli military campaign, which is designed to destroy our people and their future, including the Palestinian Authority, and consequently is aimed at reverting to the situation that prevailed in the pre-Oslo era and at destroying the prospects for peace.

After Mr. Ariel Sharon assumed office, it became clear that the deteriorating situation in the region would worsen, moving towards a real crisis that threatened to tip us all into the abyss. From the very start, the man was very clear; he said that he did not want a final peace agreement, but only a new transitional arrangement. He said that he opposed the recommendations of the Mitchell committee, and he prevented the implementation of those recommendations, burying them, just as, later, he buried the Tenet plan. He said that he wished that he had killed Yasser Arafat in Beirut, and that the Palestinians should be battered hard, without let-up, so that they would feel severe pain. He even said that there was no occupation. This is the "man of peace" whose positions were covered up by some until we reacted to the present disaster.

In response to the suicide bombings in Israel, which have been unequivocally condemned by the Palestinian Authority and have harmed our Palestinian national interest, Mr. Sharon attacked the Palestinian security apparatus instead of attacking the groups that committed the bombings. He attacked the Palestinian Authority and the vision of peace, instead of attacking

the opposing political vision that seeks the continuation of confrontation and violence.

After a prolonged period of continuous and systematic destruction, ranging from the demolition of police stations to the demolition of Gaza International Airport, Mr. Sharon pushed the Israeli occupying forces in an all-out military assault against Palestinian cities, villages and refugee camps in most of the West Bank, starting on 29 March 2002. The occupying forces committed all manner of atrocities against our people, using all kinds of weaponry, including war planes and helicopter gunships, as well as tanks. They stormed the Ramallah compound of President Yasser Arafat — our elected President and the symbol of our national struggle — and imposed on him a military siege that even went so far as to endanger his personal safety.

The Israeli occupying forces have carried out the wilful killing of civilians as well as extrajudicial executions. They have used civilians as human shields and imposed various forms of collective detention, including the imposition of curfews for several days at a time. They have repeatedly obstructed the movement of ambulances, medical workers and humanitarian organizations and even prevented them from reaching those in need. They have also caused vast and unjustified destruction — destruction that defies belief — of the Palestinian infrastructure, including water and electrical supplies and road networks, and the destruction of several ministerial buildings, along with all their contents and records. They have carried out widespread physical devastation and destroyed hundreds of vehicles. They have demolished homes and civilian quarters, in particular in the old city of Nablus and in Bethlehem. They have attacked mosques and churches and imposed a siege on the Church of the Nativity, the birthplace of Jesus — peace be upon Him — attacking it several times and causing fire and other damage to the church compound.

Then came the attack on the Jenin refugee camp — an area of 1 square kilometre — in which 13,000 refugees, who were uprooted from their homes and properties in 1948, had been living. The camp was obliterated by bulldozers after helicopter gunships fired missiles at it. For more than 11 days, the Israeli occupying forces then prevented international humanitarian organizations, including the International Committee of the Red Cross, from entering the camp to deliver emergency medicine and food.

The Israeli occupying forces have thus committed serious violations of human rights and have violated the laws governing armed conflict. They have committed grave breaches of the Fourth Geneva Convention; in other words, they have committed war crimes. That is clear and it has been documented. In addition to the fact that they clearly committed war crimes, they may also have carried out a massacre and committed a crime against humanity in the Jenin refugee camp. The probability of that having happened has increased with the statements made by the occupying forces about hundreds being killed in the camp and with their attempts to move the bodies to what they called the "graveyard of the enemy".

It is incumbent upon the international community to take a stand against the horrendous acts committed by the Israeli occupying forces against our people. They may have taken place because no serious stand was taken against previous horrendous acts, such as the massacres of Sabra and Shatila, Deir Yassin, Kofr Qassim, Quibia, and Khan Yunis. The High Contracting Parties to the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 have a clear obligation to respond with regard to the perpetrators of war crimes. We call upon those States, and on the United Nations system, which should play its part at a later stage, to hand down indictments and to prosecute those who have committed war crimes, chief among them General Shaul Mofaz, Chief of Staff of the Israeli army, as well as the commanding officers and members of the military units that have committed acts of wilful killing against civilians and unjustified acts of widespread destruction. As for responsibility at the political level, that is a matter for the courts to address at the appropriate time.

The situation resulting from the latest Israeli attacks continues to be critical despite the departure of Israeli forces from some Palestinian cities almost one month after the beginning of the assaults, and despite the lifting of the siege of the official compound of President Yasser Arafat in Ramallah a few days ago. Israeli tanks continue to impose a suffocating siege on the cities from which they have withdrawn, and the Israeli occupying forces returned to reoccupy parts of those cities several times, causing further death and destruction. Furthermore, the criminal siege of the Church of the Nativity is still going on, and the Palestinian side has been obliged to accept so-called negotiations in order to end the situation.

The substance and the aim of the latest Israeli military assault have thus not changed. There are no areas under the control of the Palestinian Authority that have not been rendered incapable of fully functioning. Moreover, the Palestinian populated centres continue to be suffocated; people are unable to lead normal lives and are very close to Israeli forces and tanks. Confronted by all of this, some think we should have been happy when the Israeli side ended its siege against the President or when negotiations began with regard to the siege of the Church of the Nativity. Yet our people are screaming out in pain at the suffering, oppression and injustice; they are being forced to lose hope, and feel frustrated and angry.

As for the crisis of the international system, the matter is now clear. The Charter confers upon the Security Council, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations, primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. However, the Council has been unable to fulfil its responsibilities with regard to the Middle East, particularly during the past 16 months.

Specifically, after the onset of the all-out Israeli military assault, the Security Council adopted, on 30 March, resolution 1402 (2002), and we were optimistic, despite the weakness of the resolution. Before that, we had been even more optimistic after the adoption of resolution 1397 (2002) and the important positive change that occurred at the time. Resolution 1402 (2002) called for, inter alia, the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Palestinian cities, including Ramallah.

Several days later, however, it became clear that the Israeli forces were intensifying their assaults instead of withdrawing in accordance with the Council resolution. Then, after exhaustive efforts, another modest resolution was adopted on 4 April — resolution 1403 (2002) — which called for the implementation of resolution 1402 (2002) without delay. The Security Council and the entire world then witnessed for many days and weeks the continuing Israeli horror, carried out in complete contempt of the Council's resolutions, which to date have not been fully implemented.

Some major Powers have recently been involved in an attempt to improve the situation and to move forward one step here and another there, which we appreciate. But the Council's resolutions have still not been fully implemented.

Then came the great scandal with regard to resolution 1405 (2002), which welcomed the initiative of the Secretary-General to develop accurate information regarding the recent events in the Jenin refugee camp through a fact-finding team. The resolution requested the Secretary-General to keep the Security Council informed. Israel, the occupying Power, welcomed the resolution and even expressed its readiness to cooperate. Then, with what appears to be rejection by its military establishment, Israel changed its mind and began a campaign to pressure and blackmail the Secretary-General and the Secretariat to change the composition of the team and to guarantee that its results would go in a particular direction. Throughout the events, the Security Council remained a spectator despite our attempts to push it to take a position.

In spite of this, the Secretary-General maintained his position with regard to the integrity of the team and to preserving its appropriate method of work. However, in the end, as a result of Israel's refusal to cooperate with the team and to implement resolution 1405 (2002), the Secretary-General was compelled to inform the Security Council of what had taken place and of his conclusion that the team had to be disbanded.

What the Security Council has done — it is difficult to believe — is nothing. The Arab Group attempted to submit a resolution under Chapter VII to compel Israel to cooperate. However, this was considered an extreme position. Then, 24 hours before the fact-finding team was disbanded, we submitted a modest text aimed at maintaining the team and pressuring Israel, the occupying Power, to accept it. The draft did not receive sufficient support because of the threat of veto. What was offered to us in return was a resolution expressing regret for Israel's position — only regret — and approving the disbanding of the team with a request to the Secretary-General to inform the Council when accurate information on what happened became available to him. Of course, we could not accept this.

All of this has occurred while dealing with an occupying Power that has no sovereign mandates. We are speaking of occupied territory to which the Fourth Geneva Convention is applicable, as affirmed in 24 resolutions of the Security Council. The result now is that there will be no fact-finding team on what happened in the Jenin refugee camp. At the same time,

Israel is protected and shielded from any serious reaction from the Council.

Why has all this occurred? How could this happen? Are Security Council resolutions selective? Are they subject to negotiation and change? Is there a particular Security Council to deal with Arab States that might not comply with its resolutions and another Security Council for Israel when it fails to comply? Is it possible, when one of the members of the Council is enjoying unprecedented influence, such as the United States, that such influence would allow for putting the Charter aside and ignoring international law and international humanitarian law? What are the responsibilities of the other members, permanent and elected, in such a case? If deterioration actually reaches this level, is there a possible remedy? If there is no remedy, what are the destructive consequences of this situation for the international system and international relations?

These are serious questions. I think that we all bear responsibility to consider them and to try to find answers in order to preserve the existing international system. The question now, frankly, is not whether the Security Council will lose its credibility. This has already happened. The question is whether the Council will be able to restore that credibility.

I would also like to note that all of this did not occur suddenly or just during the last few weeks. This has been taking place over many years before our very eyes. Israel, the occupying Power, has refused to comply with 29 resolutions of the Security Council. Nothing has happened. Israel has violated and destroyed the international humanitarian law system — which was adopted by the world following the horrors of the Second World War — comprising the four Geneva conventions.

The Fourth Geneva Convention aims at protecting civilians in time of war and also preventing the reoccurrence of colonialism through the transfer of population. Israel has practised precisely that and has transferred 400,000 Israelis to the occupied Palestinian territory, building illegal settlements for them on our land and exploiting our natural resources. Israel, by its practices, has violated all the ideals and values cherished by the civilized world, such as justice, freedom, the right to self-determination, human rights and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction.

Lastly, Israel is about to accomplish another achievement, and that is the hijacking of the international agenda on combating international terrorism. We all have stood with the United States in the face of the blind acts of terrorism of 11 September. The world indeed did form a wide coalition to combat international terrorism. Given this coalition, it is disgraceful for Israel, the only occupying Power in the world, to be allowed to succeed in linking its criminal acts against our people and the fight against international terrorism, including what the United States has done in Afghanistan. Such an attempt could only lead to undermining the legitimacy of the fight against international terrorism, and what is even more dangerous, as we warned in previous statements, it promotes conflict among civilizations and religious confrontation, only to serve Israel's expansionist goals and its violation of international law and international legitimacy.

All this was not enough for Israel. Maybe, in order to be able to do all of that, Israel launches horrendous campaigns of systematic lies, misinformation and even psychological warfare against our people and its leadership. It also launches smear campaigns and intimidation campaigns against those it considers enemies — in practice, those who dare to speak the truth at the international level. You need only look to the accusations lately made against respected international personalities, at least some of whom have always been friends of Israel. We now hear a return to talk of a Palestinian leadership that aims at the destruction of Israel; Arafat who cannot be trusted; a biased United Nations; and anti-Israel sentiment. There is even the horrible accusation of anti-Semitism, which is now freely being used right and left. All of this is evidence of the ethical and moral bankruptcy of the Israeli Government and its friends.

It is incumbent upon the international community to take a serious stand — not merely to be consistent with the principles of the Charter and international law, and not only to put an end to the suffering of our people or to help it restore its national and inalienable rights, but also to rescue Israel from these mad tendencies and to give Israeli society an opportunity to look into its internal situation in order to correct it and return to the right direction.

Lately some rays of hope have appeared in the distance, and serious talks have begun on the necessity of taking a comprehensive approach, which includes

the security situation, reconstruction and acceleration of the political process towards a permanent solution based on the principle of two States. The "quartet" has been specifically active in this field. All of these are matters that we welcome, and we express our readiness to cooperate with all the efforts to put an end to this existing catastrophe and to return to the path of peace.

However, we reaffirm our absolute rejection of all proposals for transitional arrangements, which in reality aim at keeping the occupation and relieving the Israeli side of facing its responsibilities. As for the proposal for an international conference, we believe that it could form a suitable mechanism, provided that the "quartet" and others participate in it, most importantly, all of the concerned Arab parties, and provided that it is preceded with an agreement on the substance and guidelines regarding the final goal based on resolutions of international legitimacy and the Arab peace initiative, which was endorsed by the Arab Summit in Beirut in March. The substance is the main thing, and we should not focus on a mechanism as an alternative to dealing seriously with the substance.

However, before achieving all this, the horrific situation on the ground must come to an end and the Israeli forces must withdraw from all the areas that should be under the control of the Palestinian Authority in accordance with agreements. In this connection, we reiterate that we welcome the proposal of the Secretary-General concerning the establishment of a robust and credible multinational force to be deployed on the ground to create better conditions and to provide an opportunity for the reconstruction of the institutions of the Palestinian Authority, including its security apparatus, and to assist the two sides in implementing agreements. We also call for the strengthening of the role of the United Nations, which should start with the Security Council shouldering its responsibilities in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

I would like, in conclusion, to thank all of you immensely on behalf of the Palestinian people and the Palestinian leadership.

Mr. Erwa (Sudan) (*spoke in Arabic*): It is an honour for me to make this statement on behalf of the Arab Group, on whose behalf I also wish to thank you, Mr. President, for having responded promptly to the request for a resumption of the tenth emergency special session of the General Assembly. This session is to deal with the ongoing perilous situation in the occupied Palestinian territories resulting from Israeli aggression in Palestinian occupied towns and villages, notably in East Jerusalem. I would also like to say at the outset that I fully subscribe to the statement made by South Africa on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

The occupied Palestinian territories are experiencing one of the most dangerous situations since Israel began its military aggression against occupied Palestinian towns and the Palestinian Authority in March 2002. Despite Security Council resolutions 1402 (2002), 1403 (2002) and 1405 (2002), and the repeated appeals of the international community for it to withdraw immediately from the occupied territories and to end its bloody acts of aggression, Israel, the occupying Power, has for the past two months disregarded these resolutions and has persisted in destroying the Palestinian Authority and besieging its leadership, as well as in laying siege to the Church of the Nativity, the cradle of Christianity. In carrying out their military operations, the occupying forces have committed very serious war crimes and flagrant violations of the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, including deliberately bombing civilians and planning to systematically assassinate and detain defenceless Palestinians. The world has witnessed the heinous acts perpetrated by the occupying forces in the Jenin refugee camp. Those forces have destroyed houses before their occupants could vacate them. The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) and other humanitarian agencies have been denied access to the Palestinian population. It is regrettable that Israel carries out these terrorist acts under the pretext of combating terrorism.

The Arab Group would like to thank Secretary-General Kofi Annan for his significant efforts and for his request to the Security Council to enact the necessary measures to stop the tragedy that is unfolding in occupied Palestine. Among the measures is the initiative to establish a multinational force under Chapter VII of the Charter and to set up a fact-finding team made up of eminent international personalities well known for their credibility, great professional competence and impartiality to shed light on the real events that took place in Jenin. In resolution 1405 (2002), the Security Council welcomed that initiative and asked the Secretary-General to keep it informed of the team's work. The Arab Group would also like to

praise the Secretary-General for his patience, as well as for the efforts of the Secretariat to shed the necessary light on the situation.

However, despite all those efforts, the team was unable to fulfil its mandate. Israel was intransigent, reversed its position and publicly expressed its rejection of the team. The Secretary-General therefore had to go back to the Security Council to explain that it was Israel's refusal that was standing in the way of the team's carrying out its functions. The State of Israel was born as a result of a United Nations resolution. Nevertheless, it continues, in its intransigence, to occupy Arab territories, including the Syrian Golan and parts of southern Lebanon, in violation of international law, while disregarding the Charter of the United Nations. It is for this reason that the Arab Group is hopeful that the Security Council will condemn the scorn demonstrated by Israel towards Council resolutions and its violation of international law, including international humanitarian law.

We had hoped that the fact-finding team would be able to do its job. However, because of Israel's intransigent position, which is an affront to the international community, the team was unable to perform its functions and the Security Council was unable to adopt the necessary measures to force Israel to comply with its resolutions fully and unconditionally and to cooperate with the fact-finding team in accordance with resolution 1405 (2002).

In the light of this situation, the Arab Group has resorted to the General Assembly, which in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations must consider general principles governing cooperation in the area of international peace and security. We urge the Assembly to condemn the position of Israel, the occupying Power, which has refused to accept the fact-finding team set up by the Secretary-General and supported by the Security Council. We must condemn Israel for its disregard of, and scorn for, the Security Council and international law, including humanitarian law. In accordance with its mandate in the area of international peace and security, the General Assembly should today send an unequivocal message to Israel, the only occupying Power in the world, calling on it to abide by the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 and to respect the civilian population.

We must also condemn Israeli practices against the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian towns, including the Jenin refugee camp, and call on Israel to remove all obstacles in the way of humanitarian assistance to the occupied Palestinian territories. We urge the international community, as represented by the General Assembly, to gather all the necessary information on the crimes committed by Israeli forces in Jenin.

In the light of all this, the Arab Group strongly supports all the elements of the draft resolution under consideration and calls on all Member States to support it.

In conclusion, the Arab Group reaffirms its solidarity with the Palestinian people and its leadership in their efforts to exercise their just and legitimate international rights, including the right to an independent State with the holy city of Jerusalem as its capital.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Senegal, who is currently Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.

Mr. Fall (Senegal), Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (*spoke in French*): We meet once again today in the framework of the tenth emergency special session of the General Assembly in the wake of the apparent inability of the Security Council to ensure respect for its own resolutions and to exercise its statutory responsibilities following the grave events that have devastated the occupied Palestinian territories, including Jerusalem.

Indeed, for several months now, the international community, impotent or indifferent, has witnessed the continuing and unbridled intensification of Israeli aggression against the Palestinian people in its occupied territories, sowing death and desolation on a scale rarely equalled, under the pretext of the repression of terrorism and against the backdrop of economic blockade, a financial freeze and the besieging of institutions.

Considerably damaged, severely dismembered and perhaps even irretrievably destroyed, no social and administrative element of the Palestinian infrastructure continues to function. The captive economy of the territory has disintegrated, while the people — terrified, haggard and distraught — are being offered no alternative by the occupying Power to resentment,

anger and protest, sometimes in questionable form, in response to the acts of violence, provocation and terror of the Israeli steamroller.

The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, which I have the honour to chair, must acknowledge its frustration and distress in the face of the Security Council's lack of success, if not outright failure, in vigilantly monitoring the situation in Palestine and in imposing the implementation of its resolutions. In that respect, we refer to the disbanding of the fact-finding team on the tragic events in Jenin, to which the Secretary-General was forced to resort in the face of Israel's refusal to cooperate with the United Nations, as if Tel Aviv had something to be ashamed of or to hide in its repeated attempts to marginalize President Arafat and to challenge his legitimacy, going so far as to dictate to the Palestinians the choice of their leader.

Notwithstanding such a negative attitude, which further undermines the authority and credibility of this global Organization, and the hindrance of the United Nations fact-finding mission, the international community — first and foremost the Security Council and the General Assembly — is solemnly and urgently called upon somehow to assess, objectively and rigorously, the tragic situation in Jenin. Far from being based on a deliberate desire to anathematize anyone, the collection of reliable information on what really happened is, rather, a duty of justice and equity in the face of the culture of impunity, selective treatment and self-absolving complacency which all Israeli extremists and their notorious supporters seek to enjoy at any cost.

Although our indignation may be strong and legitimate with respect to the tragic events in Jenin, Ramallah, Bethlehem and dozens of other Palestinian towns and refugee camps, we cannot ignore the faintly positive developments that have begun to emerge, such as the end of the illegal confinement of President Arafat and the regained freedom of movement of the head of the Palestinian Authority. Nor have we given up hope for a peaceful settlement of the Israeli siege of the Church of the Nativity; nor for the decision of the "quartet" of mediators to convene an international conference, which has yet to be defined, on the Palestinian question; nor for any American, European or other initiative to resurrect the peace process.

The international community is clearly aware of the scope of the human and humanitarian tragedy in Palestine and of the urgent need for international protection, in one form or another, of the Palestinian people and for seeking ways and means to punish violations of international humanitarian law and of the Fourth Geneva Convention. Left to themselves, face to face, the Israelis and Palestinians, unfortunately, can only continue to wage war under the impulse of the fury, convulsions and hatred that feed exasperation, demonization and vengeance. Such feelings are constantly being fuelled by certain extremist and terrorist headquarters, by which the peace process is only too often held hostage.

The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People is of the view that certain very stubborn facts and principles cannot be recalled too often. First and foremost, Israel's illegal occupation of Palestinian territory, including Jerusalem, and its scorn for the relevant United Nations resolutions and the norms of international humanitarian law are at the very heart of the Palestinian question, the settlement of which will determine the issue of peace in the Middle East.

Since the strong-arm policy of all-out military force has demonstrated its uselessness and given rise to unbelievably perverse effects, we must therefore consider the new, innovative and comprehensive approaches offered by the Secretary-General in the light of the Saudi plan adopted at the Beirut summit of 28 March and in the context of resolution 1397 (2002), in which the Security Council for the first time evokes the vision of two States, Israel and Palestine, living side by side within secure and recognized borders.

Furthermore, given the steps being taken by the American, Russian, European and United Nations sponsors, the international community must, at the risk of losing its credibility, compel the implementation of Security Council resolutions 1402 (2002) of 30 March and 1403 (2002) of 4 April, demanding a genuine ceasefire and the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all reoccupied Palestinian cities and towns. The Security Council must also require, by all appropriate means, the implementation of resolution 1405 (2002) of 19 April, which implicitly condemns Israeli violations of international humanitarian standards and approves the dispatch, rejected by Israel, of a fact-finding mission following the reported massacres in Jenin and the West Bank.

Above all, the path to peace is inseparable from the creation of an independent and viable Palestinian State, and any agreement reached, in order to be just and durable, must take into consideration the case of Jerusalem as well as the problem of Palestinian refugees and their right to return.

Finally, the United Nations has the sacred duty to continue exercising its full responsibility with regard to the question of Palestine until its effective and comprehensive settlement with respect for resolutions 242 (1967), 338 (1973) and 1397 (2002), on the basis of the founding principles of land for peace and withdrawal in exchange for conditions of normalcy.

By calling on the parties, in particular Israel, to conform strictly to those resolutions as well as to the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilians Persons in Time of War, we appeal solemnly to the protagonists and actors of good will for a salutary return to the negotiating table, without failing to urge the donor community to mobilize important emergency assistance to help populations in extreme distress and significant economic assistance to a completely destroyed Palestinian Authority.

The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People does not despair of finally seeing Israelis and Palestinians resolutely seize the olive branch of the Arab Summit in Beirut. In that spirit, I should like to refer to a statement by former United States Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski:

> "On the initiative of the United States, the Security Council should promote today a specific peace plan based on four points: the resolutions of the Security Council, the quasi-agreement concluded at Taba in January 2001, the Saudi peace plan and the deployment of an international force with a view to restoring confidence while contributing to ensuring security between both parties."

Prompted by strong convictions and the fervent hope that sustains them, the Committee earnestly hopes that the resumption of the tenth emergency special session of the General Assembly will lead, through the cooperation of all Member States without exclusion, to the adoption, thanks to massive support, of the draft resolution submitted for consideration.

Mr. Aboul Gheit (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): Once again, the General Assembly resumes its tenth emergency special session on the question of Palestine. The international community — indeed, the whole world — has seen the tragic events and inhuman violations that have taken place in Palestinian towns, villages and lands over the past few weeks. The General Assembly is meeting today to save the United Nations from that abysmal failure, which over the past few days has afflicted the work of the Security Council and has revealed the Council's inability to fulfil its responsibilities to defend the Charter, the principles of international humanitarian law, the Fourth Geneva Convention and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Mr. Loizaga (Paraguay), Vice-President, took the Chair.

With a heavy heart and sad feelings, mankind watched the Israeli army's actions of destruction, deliberate murder and devastation under the direction of its political leadership. The Security Council responded to the deteriorating situation with a series of resolutions reflecting international legality, in particular resolution 1397 (2002) and then resolutions 1402 (2002) and 1403 (2002). The Secretary-General moved to assemble a fact-finding mission to investigate the breaches and war crimes committed by the Israeli army. The Council expeditiously adopted a United States-sponsored resolution that welcomed the Secretary-General's initiative. Thus, resolution 1405 (2002) was adopted to emphasize the need to respect international humanitarian law. Days passed, and the Government of Israel refused to receive the international fact-finding team and to cooperate with it. Unfortunately, the Security Council fell silent, and then the Secretary-General announced that he would disband the team after having abandoned all hope for meaningful support from the Council.

We all know the real and direct cause of the events taking place in the occupied Palestinian territory: the continuous Israeli occupation of Palestinian territory in the West Bank and Gaza for some 35 years. During that time, Israel has tried to carry out a policy of colonial settlement. Despite the convening of the Madrid Conference in October 1991 and the conclusion of the Oslo Accord in 1993, many parties inside Israel began working to abort those agreements and to block their implementation. Apparently, those parties do not want to see an end to their occupation or to their usurpation of the rights of

Palestinians. Indeed, they wish to oppose United Nations resolutions by force.

Those actions were accompanied by the expansion and intensification of Israeli settlement activity, suffocating the Palestinian people in a bid to push it to despair and make it succumb to occupation and the renunciation of its rights. That did not happen and will never happen. The Palestinian people and its legitimate leadership continued to resist occupation by all available means in the face of a brutal and overwhelming force.

With great sadness and in futile condemnation, the world watched the events over the past 20 months, while the occupying Power bared its fangs against a people that rose up to claim its inalienable rights, in particular the right to self-determination. Like all peoples of the world who put an end to colonialism — except Israel's colonization of Palestinian territory occupied after 4 June 1967 — that heroic people did not stand alone. In fact, the majority of countries that uphold established rights, justice and the rule of law stood by its side.

The current tragic situation in the occupied Palestinian territory, recently reoccupied, must end immediately. The occupying force must cease forthwith all its illegal actions — assassinating leaders and activists who resist occupation, destroying towns and villages, suffocating the economic infrastructure and committing acts of aggression and humiliation against civilians. All those crimes and insults must end immediately.

The General Assembly is required to defend international law, international humanitarian law and the right of peoples to self-determination by ensuring that United Nations resolutions are implemented and not disregarded.

Today, the General Assembly, whose duty it is to defend the credibility and effectiveness of the Charter, must reaffirm its condemnation of the Israeli violations of the Palestinian territory and of the Palestinian people. The Assembly should request the Secretary-General to prepare a comprehensive report on the violations, acts of aggression and crimes of war committed by soldiers of the Israeli army against Palestinian civilians in Palestinian towns and villages in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. We have no doubt that such a report of the Secretary-General will be carried out.

We are confident that the current situation and the persistence of the occupation will not continue, and that all international Powers having influence with Israel must redouble their genuine efforts to bring about a lasting and just settlement of the tragic situation from which the Palestinian people continue to suffer. The path to such a just settlement must be achieved through the following crucial steps.

First, the immediate cessation of the ongoing Israeli aggression and the withdrawal of Israeli forces from territory under the control of the Palestinian Authority to the borders existing before 28 September 2000; an end to the Israeli force's repeated incursions; and the prompt dispatch of an international observer and monitoring force as proposed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Secondly, an end to the armed confrontations and acts of violence in order that a period of calm combined with comprehensive political negotiations leading to a just, final settlement may be established.

Thirdly, as a basis for negotiations, such a settlement must include compliance with all previously agreed upon international legal instruments, namely, United Nations resolutions, especially Security Council resolutions 242 (1967), 338 (1973) and 1397 (2002); the Madrid process, namely the principle of land for peace; and the accords and understandings which both the Israeli and Palestinian parties concluded in December 2000 and January 2001.

Finally, such a settlement must include the Arab peace initiative, which states that a final settlement must include Israeli withdrawal from Palestinian territories occupied after 4 June 1967, a freeze on settlements and the dismantling of existing settlements, the right of Palestinians to self-determination and the creation of the State of Palestine with East Jerusalem as its capital. It must also include the right of both sides to equal security through mutually agreed measures that do not favour the invaders and through a just and practical settlement of the question of Palestinian refugees on the basis of United Nations resolutions and international law.

Any effort to reach a settlement must be based on all those key elements in order to ensure its success. However, one of the most crucial elements in ensuring such success is the inclusion of a time frame for the steps towards the settlement. Negotiations between the two sides cannot remain open-ended indefinitely. No

negotiations can be accepted that would last 10 years without achieving the goals of the Palestinian people or that would repeat the manoeuvres used by Israel over the years since the Madrid Conference of 1991. Neither security for both sides nor peace and stability for the two peoples in the region and for the whole region will be ensured without a just settlement. The United Nations has defined such a settlement and it has been unanimously accepted by the Arab countries, while the Government of Israel continues to throw up obstacles in order to impede enforcement and the implementation of agreements reached.

The Palestinian people need the greatest support possible from the international community, especially in the wake of the destruction of the infrastructure of all their institutions and of most of the facilities in all towns and villages.

In closing, I wish to emphasize here that the banner of the Palestinian people will remain hoisted high and that the flag of Palestine will be held by President Yasser Arafat, the democratically elected and legitimate leader of the Palestinian people. The Palestinians will resist the occupation they are suffering with the support of all forces that believe in the rule of law, justice, legality, genuine peace and security. Indeed, occupation will come to end and the State of Palestine will come into existence; it will live in peace with its neighbours, once the neighbouring State ceases to occupy its territory in breach of every norm, law and principle.

Mr. Negroponte (United States of America): The United States is fully committed to a settlement of the conflict in the Middle East. We are a strong friend of Israel, and we are also friends of the Palestinian people. The way forward to peace will not be advanced by resolutions such as this or through unbalanced rhetoric that prejudges what the parties must work out.

We believe the best way forward is to advance the comprehensive strategy that the "quartet" reaffirmed following its meeting last week. The three elements of this strategy are: one, security and freedom from terror and violence for both Israelis and Palestinians; two, serious and accelerated negotiations to revive hope and to lead to a political settlement; and three, economic and humanitarian assistance to address the increasingly desperate conditions faced by the Palestinian people. These are not just words. The "quartet" discussed concrete actions that must be taken to help realize this political vision.

This strategy has broad support both in the region and in the international community. We remain closely engaged with the parties, the quartet and regional leaders to move the process forward. Secretary of State Colin Powell met with Saudi Foreign Minister Saud Al-Faisal, Jordanian King Abdullah and Israeli Prime Minister Sharon yesterday to move forward with implementation. President Bush will meet Prime Minister Sharon today and King Abdullah tomorrow to discuss ways to pursue Middle East peace.

As Secretary Powell said on Sunday:

> "We are trying to continue this process, which began with the President's speech on 4 April talking about a vision of a Palestinian State, and asking all Palestinian leaders to move in a new strategic direction where the United States can help them achieve their goal, and our goal, of a Palestinian State."

The Security Council met 32 times on the Middle East last month, sidelining all other matters. Frankly, we were puzzled by the Palestinian decision to resort to a resumption of the emergency special session at this time of Security Council activism and new diplomatic initiative.

On 12 March, Security Council resolution 1397 (2002), which my Government sponsored, affirmed a vision of a region in which two States — Israel and Palestine — live side by side within secure and recognized borders. Resolution 1402 (2002) calls upon both parties to move immediately to a meaningful ceasefire; it calls for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Palestinian cities, including Ramallah; and it demands an immediate cessation of all acts of violence, including acts of terror, provocation, incitement and destruction.

We can report progress in the implementation of these Security Council resolutions. We are working intensively to end the stand-off at the Church of the Nativity and to complete the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the last of the Palestinian cities, Bethlehem. Hopefully, this will be resolved very soon. However, much remains to be done by Israel, by the Palestinian Authority, by Arab leaders and by the international community in order to bring an end to terror and violence.

The draft resolution before the General Assembly today bears little resemblance to Security Council resolutions on the Middle East. This draft is filled with one-sided rhetoric condemning one party in this two-party conflict. While some of the most objectionable language may be toned down as a result of negotiations, the original intent to isolate Israel has prevailed. There is not even mention of Palestinian terror attacks against Israeli civilians, which have done so much harm to prospects for peace in the Middle East.

Let me reiterate what my deputy, Ambassador James Cunningham, explained during the recent Security Council debate on Friday night. As sponsors of Security Council resolution 1405 (2002), welcoming the Secretary-General's initiative to send a fact-finding team to Jenin, we do not believe that any Member State is in violation of operative paragraph 2 of that resolution. It is time to move forward and to deal with many of the other pressing problems facing the region.

We will vote against the draft resolution that is before the Assembly because we are focused on working directly with the parties to bring results, and because we believe the condemnatory rhetoric against Israel contained in this draft resolution will not contribute to the efforts of the international community to urge both parties to take the decisions they need to make to end violence and return to negotiations. To those who believe that draft resolutions like this one — and the speeches that endorse them — help the Palestinian people, I suggest that such rhetoric does the very opposite. It undermines the credibility of their cause and deepens the divide between the Palestinians and a neighbour with whom one day, sooner or later, they will have to live in peace.

Mr. Nejad Hosseinian (Islamic Republic of Iran): Mr. President, I thank you for having convened this important meeting, and I hope that the Assembly, by the action it will take, will live up to the expectations the United Nations has created across the globe. The convening of this session is promising in the sense that it demonstrates the determination of the general membership of the United Nations to express its outrage at the illegal activities of Israelis in the occupied territories and to follow up on the Palestinian question.

At the same time, we deeply regret that once again the failure of the Council to fulfil its Charter responsibilities has prompted the Assembly to take up the grave situation in Palestine, which threatens peace and security in the entire Middle East region. It is all the more regrettable that, while the vast majority of the Council's members have struggled to deal effectively with illegal Israeli actions in the occupied Palestinian territories, a single member of the Security Council has missed no opportunity to scuttle every effort to effectively address the issue.

There is no doubt that the Council's inaction in the face of Israeli contempt for its recent resolutions will go down in the history of the Security Council as one of its major failures in the process of furthering the cause of peace and security in the world. It also will go down in history as another example of the double standard forced upon the Council by a very small number of its members. We hope that the Council will follow up on its recent resolutions and take steps to address the non-compliance by the Israeli regime with its terms.

The convening of this session bears witness to Israel's intransigent policy of total disregard for the principles of international law and the demands of the international community, including Security Council resolutions 1402 (2002), 1403 (2002) and 1405 (2002). The resolutions adopted so far by this special session condemning the Israeli regime for failing to comply with the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention and the decisions of the Assembly continue to be flouted and remain unimplemented.

Over the past 19 months, acts of provocation, the desecration of holy shrines, extrajudicial killings, the excessive and disproportionate use of force in civilian areas and the bulldozing of homes, culminating in the recent war crimes and massacre committed in the Jenin refugee camp, have figured prominently among the illegal and criminal activities perpetrated by the occupying Power in the Palestinian occupied territories.

Moreover, the sieges and closures imposed by the Israelis are suffocating the Palestinian economy. There is no doubt that such restrictions amount to the imposing of collective punishment on an entire population. The Israelis are also engaged in systematically tearing down the Palestinian institutional capacity and weakening the elected Palestinian leader, who has been their long-time peace partner. In so doing, they have dropped the empty

pretence of seeking peace, which they had adopted for several years.

All of that proves once more the untrustworthy and irresponsible nature of the Israeli regime, which has been demonstrated time and again over the past several years through its violations of many agreements, despite the fact that the terms of such agreements were clearly in its favour.

Consensus opinion, expressed and maintained by the international community over recent decades, stresses explicitly the applicability to all the Arab and Palestinian territories of the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. The continuation of illegal acts by the Israeli regime constitutes an intentional and complete violation of that Convention, as well as of numerous United Nations resolutions and international legal and political instruments. What happened recently in Jenin was the latest in a long list of grave breaches of the Fourth Geneva Convention by Israel as the occupying Power.

We believe that it is absolutely necessary for the international community, represented by the United Nations, to look into the war crimes perpetrated by the Israeli forces over the past 19 months, especially the atrocities committed in Jenin and elsewhere in the occupied territories. It is imperative for the international community to bring the perpetrators to justice and to act in such a way as to prevent the recurrence of such crimes in the future.

The question of Palestine continues to remain the responsibility of the United Nations, as the only universal and the most representative body of the international community. As such, it cannot and must not fail the people of Palestine. The Middle East region has been marked by enduring crises, constant tension and destructive confrontations for more than half a century. The situation requires that the international community effectively tackle the Palestinian issue with a view to bringing durable peace and justice to the Palestinian land and tranquillity to the region as a whole.

Mr. Lancry (Israel): It is now more than 18 months since violence and terrorism broke out in the Middle East. During that time, there has been a heartbreaking loss of innocent life, a devastating effect on the economic well-being of the region and a deterioration in our faith in the possibility of peace.

These are tragic developments that are the result of the resurgence of Palestinian terrorism and of the strategic decision of the Palestinian leadership to abandon a political process filled with promise and hope in favour of a strategy of terrorism that has led only to chaos and ruin.

It is this choice that is responsible for the deaths of civilians on both sides. It is this choice that has devastated the Palestinian economy. It is this choice that has caused many Israelis to lose faith in our Palestinian partners and forced the Israeli military to take action in order to protect Israeli civilians from an unrelenting threat. And it is this choice that has led us directly to the crisis that we are facing today.

Responsibility for all these destructive consequences lies fully with those who have horrifically demonstrated their preference for violence over dialogue, for war over peace.

The vision laid out in Security Council resolution 1397 (2002) of two States living side by side was clearly within reach at Camp David and Taba. But its rejection by Chairman Arafat and the subsequent wave of Palestinian terror that continues to this day have led many Israelis to conclude that the Palestinian leadership is not interested in the creation of a Palestinian State.

After many months of ongoing violence and terrorism in the Middle East, we once again have cause for hope. Although one would never know it from listening to some of our deliberations here in New York, there have been a number of positive developments in the last several days.

Meeting in Washington last week, the members of the "quartet" announced a new initiative — an international peace conference on the Middle East to be convened this summer. Also last week, we successfully negotiated a non-violent settlement to the stand-off at Chairman Arafat's compound in Ramallah. Negotiations continue in an effort to achieve a similarly peaceful settlement at the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem. In addition, Israeli forces have virtually completed their withdrawal from Palestinian cities and towns, as required by resolution 1402 (2002).

But the primary positive development is the lull in Palestinian terrorist action as a result of the harsh blow dealt by the Israeli military to the terrorist infrastructure. This respite, after a year and a half of

virtually non-stop terrorist acts, has created a window of opportunity, both for Chairman Arafat and the international community. With Chairman Arafat fully able to exercise his leadership of the Palestinian people, he has the choice to build on this progress and work to further suppress Palestinian terrorism. Doing so would entail disarming Palestinian terrorist groups and creating one security body, introducing transparency in financial matters that would enhance democratic processes and making the fundamental strategic departure from the use of terrorism as a political tool. The choice to pursue this path is entirely within the Chairman's hands.

For the international community, the challenge is to take advantage of this opening. Now is the time to mobilize the forces for peace in the region, to supplement existing efforts and exert maximum pressure to keep the level of violence down, to ensure that verifiable measures are undertaken to end terrorism and incitement and to work towards the resumption of a genuine political process.

Unfortunately, here in the United Nations it seems that the Palestinian delegation is more comfortable with acrimony than with harmony. It would prefer to perpetuate a campaign of disinformation, continue one-sided condemnations of Israel and seek new resolutions and other bureaucratic diversions that serve to prevent us from exploiting the opportunity that lies before us.

Such are the tactics of the Palestinian leadership. In defiance of all reports from the region, it continues to speak of Israeli atrocities, Israeli massacres and so forth. How long should the international community indulge this kind of rhetoric?

From the very beginning of Israeli operations, in an area that even the Palestinians referred to as the capital of suicide bombings, Palestinian spokespeople alleged Israeli atrocities in the most extreme, hyperbolic terms. Palestinian Authority negotiator Saeb Erakat charged during a CNN interview on 10 April 2002 that Israeli troops had killed more than 500 people in Jenin. On 12 April, he repeated the charge that "a real massacre was committed in the Jenin refugee camp", and added that 300 Palestinians were being buried in mass graves. On 15 April, Erakat again used the term "massacre" and began to refer to Israeli actions as war crimes.

Here in New York, similar charges were made in the Security Council, even as emerging reports and media interviews with Palestinian terrorists supported Israel's claim that a fierce gun battle had taken place in Jenin, or, in their appellation, Jeningrad, and that scores of civilian dwellings had been booby-trapped with explosives. Finally, at last week's Security Council meeting, the Palestinian position was modified, and acknowledged that "perhaps" the massacre had in fact occurred.

Today, the international community is well aware that what really transpired in Jenin bears no resemblance to the Palestinian account, related in the media and at the United Nations. Fifty-six Palestinians lost their lives in Jenin, the overwhelming majority of them gunmen in a battle where 23 Israeli soldiers were killed. Of the numerous reporters and independent observers who have entered the Jenin camp, none have produced any evidence of a massacre. Had the international community known then what we know now about events in Jenin, it is doubtful that a fact-finding effort would have been considered appropriate.

Nevertheless, Palestinian claims moved the Security Council to undertake virtually non-stop deliberations. And now, Palestinian misinformation, fabrications and deliberate distortions of reality have moved the United Nations to reconvene the emergency special session. When will it end? When will we stop accepting every baseless Palestinian accusation as truth?

The Palestinian record of deliberately misleading the international community, only to have the blinding light of truth reveal these misrepresentations for what they truly are, is lengthy and well documented. Palestinian credibility is at an all-time low. Allow me to make a brief review.

Before dawn on 3 January 2002, the Israeli navy seized a freighter packed with 50 tons of sophisticated weapons bound for the Palestinian territories. The captain of the ship was a senior officer of the Palestinian naval police. The sophistication of the smuggling attempt, the costs associated with purchasing Iranian weapons and Israeli intelligence reports all made clear that this operation was organized and financed by high officials in the Palestinian Authority.

Despite the overwhelming evidence, Palestinian officials vehemently denied responsibility. In a letter circulated on 9 January 2002 (A/ES-10/137), the suggestion of official Palestinian responsibility was called "insane". The letter stated that "The Israeli story defies logic and any common sense." As late as 8 February, an official Palestinian Authority communiqué declared that: "Regarding the armed ship, the leadership reiterates that it has no knowledge of the issue."

Today, we know that responsibility for the *Karin A* affair lies with the highest echelons of the Palestinian leadership. On 31 August 2001 Adel al-Mughrabi, a Palestinian naval officer, purchased the *Karin A* in Lebanon with $400,000 provided by Fuad Shoubaki, Yasser Arafat's chief financial officer and a close confidant of the Chairman. Shoubaki was also in charge of financing the Fatah branches that carry out terrorist activities under the name of the Al-Aqsa Brigades.

Despite this and other accumulating evidence of the official Palestinian Authority role in inciting and organizing violence against Israel, Palestinian representatives have continued to maintain their innocence, asserting that terrorism emanates only from groups outside of the Palestinian Authority. Now, it is well known that the Tanzim and the Al-Aqsa Brigades operate under the direct authority of Chairman Arafat and that Chairman Arafat has chosen to reassert his authority by perpetrating more acts of terror than even Hamas or Islamic Jihad.

It is also known that the official Palestinian media — newspapers, television and radio — incite the population, including the youngest of children, to hatred and violence, with graphic images of violence, programmes that glorify Palestinian terrorism and fiery speeches by political and spiritual leaders that call for violence against Jews.

Recently, Israel has discovered documents in Chairman Arafat's Ramallah compound and elsewhere, which were sent last week to the Secretary-General and which constitute irrefutable proof of the central role played by Chairman Arafat and other high officials in the Palestinian Authority in organizing, inciting and financing acts of terror. They even include a call by Chairman Arafat himself to Israel's Arab citizens to "draw with blood the map of one homeland".

Almost immediately after Israel publicized the contents of these documents, Palestinian accusations and recriminations began. They denied their authenticity, called them fakes and forgeries and levelled their now famous accusation that the information had been taken out of context. In the Security Council, Israel's accusations were called stupid. Here again, the truth will ultimately prove itself overwhelming.

My purpose here is not to deny the suffering of the Palestinian people, but rather to highlight a disturbing pattern of Palestinian behaviour. Rather than accept responsibility for their actions and live up to their commitments, the Palestinians continually demonstrate their preference for levelling unfounded accusations that in turn serve as a basis for further action in the United Nations.

This is precisely the pattern of behaviour that led to the establishment of a fact-finding committee in Jenin. Israel accepted the need for the international community to develop accurate information regarding the incidents in Jenin. We asked only that the fact-finding team have its objectives and parameters clearly specified in accordance with the guidelines that this Assembly has established, in resolution 46/59 of 1991, and in accordance with paragraph 2 of Security Council resolution 1405 (2002). The Israeli Cabinet raised six points of concern that stem directly from these agreed parameters and guidelines.

While we have the highest respect for Secretary-General Kofi Annan and for the eminent individuals appointed by the Secretary-General, Israel did not think it too much to expect that the team's principal members include individuals with expertise that would adequately reflect all the disciplines required to develop accurate information, including in the field of security and counter-terrorism. Israel did not think it too much to expect that the fact-finding team would investigate the activities of both sides, including the use of a United Nations-administered camp as a centre for terrorist activity, in violation of international humanitarian law and Security Council resolutions. This would have been in keeping not only with basic fairness and a genuine interest in understanding the events that occurred in Jenin, but also with the guidelines and practices established regarding the conduct of fact-finding missions.

It appears, however, that when it comes to Israel, the United Nations often operates by a different set of rules. Israel cannot accept the assertion that merely asking that these basic principles be applied constitutes defiance of resolution 1405 (2002). It should be recalled that the fact-finding team was an initiative of the Secretary-General, not a demand of the Security Council. The fact that this initiative did not lead to the departure of the team, as Israel's concerns remained unresolved, does not, therefore, constitute defiance of resolution 1405 (2002).

When Palestinian spokespeople assert that a massacre occurred in Jenin, the United Nations does not wait for any evidence to support that claim. When Israelis are massacred — as has occurred countless times, not only in the past 18 months but over the last 54 years — and the gruesome images of their mangled bodies are on full display on television and in the newspaper, the United Nations is silent. No commissions are established to investigate the role of the Palestinian Authority and other regimes in the region in the perpetration of these atrocities, even though their involvement is documented and well known.

Moreover, when Israel is to be investigated the results of the investigation are routinely predetermined in advance. While the United Nations was preparing to send a team to the region for the purpose of developing accurate information regarding events in Jenin, United Nations officials were making statements to the press suggesting that the information was already known. Mr. Peter Hansen, the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), told a Danish newspaper in April that 300 to 400 Palestinians had been killed in Jenin, numbers we now know to have been highly exaggerated.

Perhaps nothing betrayed the true motives of those who initiated the fact-finding team more than the statement of the Syrian representative in the Security Council last Friday, who stated that the accused should not be permitted to choose their own judges. Clearly, in the minds of certain delegations, this was not to be a fact-finding mission at all, but rather a trial, with Israel standing accused before international judges.

The draft resolution before the Assembly today continues in that vein, condemning Israel for the atrocities it allegedly committed in Jenin, but then requesting the Secretary-General to present a report on the subject, a report whose conclusions have clearly already been determined. Today's draft resolution, like so many others that have come before, only reluctantly mentions Palestinian terrorism. Indeed, to read the draft resolution, one would think that the Palestinians are the only party that has suffered in this conflict and that Israel is the only one that has done anything wrong.

In his introduction of the draft resolution, the Permanent Representative of South Africa, on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, still criticized Israel for a culture of impunity; but, indeed, nothing could better reflect a Palestinian culture of impunity than this draft resolution, which places full blame for the current state of affairs on Israel, while it ignores any Palestinian responsibility for the crisis.

The draft resolution contains no clear and unequivocal condemnation of suicide bombings. If in this Hall this morning we were able to hear an authoritative Palestinian voice condemning suicide bombings, and if that condemnation is genuine, why does it not appear in the draft resolution? In two masterpieces of non-alignment, the Chairman of the Movement — both in the Security Council last Friday and in his words today — did not find it necessary to utter a single word in condemnation of Palestinian suicide bombings. And if the Palestinian side can condemn suicide bombings, as it did this very morning, are we to understand that the Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement is actually more Palestinian than the Palestinians themselves?

The draft resolution fails to reflect the fact that resolution 1402 (2002) puts specific obligations on the Palestinian side, including the implementation of a meaningful ceasefire, an end to terrorism and incitement, and cooperation with General Zinni — none of which the Palestinian Authority has even begun to implement. Indeed, this draft resolution seems to systematically turn a blind eye to the actions of the Palestinians, while focusing its attention exclusively on Israel.

Is it so outrageous to expect the international community to apply international humanitarian law to the Palestinians as well as to Israel? Is the behaviour of Palestinian terrorists not a clear violation of humanitarian law? In the last several weeks alone, Palestinian terrorists have used a civilian refugee area

as a base for launching terrorist attacks and storing illegal weapons and explosives. They continue to target innocent Israeli civilians, with the support of the Palestinian Authority. They have situated their headquarters in a densely populated urban area, knowing full well that their actions endanger the lives of civilians. They have done nothing to distinguish themselves from innocent civilians; on the contrary, they have disguised themselves as civilians in order to avoid retribution and have used civilians — including children — as human shields. They have taken over one of Christianity's holiest sites, the Church of the Nativity, held clergymen and others hostage inside, looted and defiled the sanctity of the place, and fired at Israeli soldiers from behind its walls. All of these actions are violations of international humanitarian law; many of them are war crimes. None of them receive even a mention in this draft resolution.

It should be obvious that humanitarian law applies both to Israel and the Palestinians. And yet, as is unfortunately typical, what is fair to any observer is not obvious and applicable in this draft resolution.

Finally, Mr. President, I would like express Israel's profound regret at the reconvening of the emergency special session. Not only is today's session unnecessary and a waste of representatives' time, but it also flouts the conditions that must be met in order to convene such a session. The draft resolution before us today will not contribute to a lessening of Palestinian terrorism. It will not provide an incentive for the Palestinian leadership to exercise its authority and lead its people towards peace and reconciliation with Israel. All it does is to further remove us from the only course of action that will address the rights and needs of both the Israeli and Palestinian peoples.

The General Assembly does not serve the interests of the Palestinian people, nor does it advance the realization of their legitimate aspirations by indulging the Palestinian appetite for endless United Nations resolutions. Rather, it harms those aspirations by reinforcing the perception among the Palestinians that no matter how much violence they provoke, how many suicide attacks they finance, or how much hatred they instil in their children, the United Nations can always be relied upon to ignore Palestinian violations and heap condemnation solely upon Israel.

The General Assembly should not act on every one-sided Palestinian initiative. It should not consider every Palestinian accusation to be an accurate reflection of the situation on the ground. The General Assembly should reject this one-sided draft resolution.

The path to peace in the Middle East is clear and has been for some time. It has been set forth in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and in the Declaration of Principles signed between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization on the White House lawn in September 1993. Violence and terrorism must be renounced in word and deed. All outstanding issues must be resolved through negotiations leading to a situation in which two States live side by side in peace and coexistence. This dream can become a reality only once the Palestinians abide by their obligations, renounce terrorism fully and finally and prepare their people for a future of peace with Israel.

Mr. Rodríguez Parrilla (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): As we did just a few months ago, we are meeting once again in this Hall to reconvene, for the seventh time, the tenth emergency special session of the General Assembly.

The convening of this meeting is fully justified. Once again, the Security Council has failed to fulfil its responsibilities and shown its inability to act in the face of the extremely serious situation in the occupied Palestinian territories. That body has been unable to react, even timidly, to the decision of the Sharon Government not to cooperate with the fact-finding team to have been sent to Jenin.

The ineffectiveness of the Security Council is obvious not only when it is unable to adopt resolutions, but also when it cannot enforce compliance with those it has adopted. Even following the adoption of resolutions 1402 (2002) and 1403 (2002), Israel continued and even intensified its savage attacks in Ramallah, Bethlehem, Tulkarem, Jenin, Nablus and other cities, without any consequences. The serious human pain and suffering inflicted by these actions on innocent Palestinian families can never be measured in figures. The material loss is incalculable. With or without a fact-finding team, the truth cannot be hidden. The actions perpetrated in Jenin will remain inscribed on yet another dark page of the tragic history of the illegal occupation of the Palestinian territories.

The Israeli Government's attitude of open challenge to the standards of international law and the principles of the United Nations Charter is the result of the imperturbability with which the Security Council

has witnessed flagrant violations of its own resolutions. That is the consequence of Israel's certainty that nothing will happen and that its war crimes will go unpunished so long as it can count, as it has done to date, on the unreserved support of a permanent member, which, with its veto and threats of veto, prevents the Council from acting. The United States has, on 24 occasions, already vetoed draft resolutions of the Security Council on the question of Palestine.

We reiterate that the United States should immediately suspend its financial support for war activities and military supplies to Israel, which, in clear complicity, include planes, helicopters and missiles used against civilians. Furthermore, it must condemn the terrorism of the Israeli State if it claims to be fighting terrorism globally, wherever and in whatever form it manifests itself.

Some would have us believe that nothing can be done and that we should passively accept the current situation or at most be satisfied with resolutions that say little and do less. We, along with the majority of Member States, have never accepted and will never accept such an approach. The convening of this meeting is proof of that. The proposal of the Secretary-General — who, throughout the entire process, has shown considerable flexibility and consistency — to establish a multinational force in the occupied territories should be seriously considered and acted on through concrete measures without further delay.

Cuba energetically condemns the acts of aggression and barbarism committed by Israel against the civilian population and Palestinian territory. We demand the return of all Arab territories occupied by Israel. We reaffirm the illegal nature of Israeli settlements in all the occupied territories. We reaffirm the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to an independent and sovereign State, with East Jerusalem as its capital.

There will be no just and lasting peace if Israel does not abandon its policy of occupation. Cuba considers that, in the face of the Security Council's inaction, ineffectiveness and discredit, the General Assembly must act, as it is doing today, to help the heroic people of Palestine, to stop the crime and to salvage the credibility of the United Nations.

For these reasons, Cuba is a sponsor and will vote in favour of the draft resolution under consideration.

Mr. Kolby (Norway): Norway welcomes the lifting of the siege on President Arafat and the peaceful solution to the stand-off at the Church of Nativity in Bethlehem, which seems to be in the making. Once again, it has been proven that diplomacy and negotiations, and not military action and violence, are the measures by which the Middle East conflict must be resolved. It also proves that it is possible to find solutions to very difficult issues when there is a commitment from the parties to negotiating and from the international community to mediating and assisting.

Norway strongly supports the efforts of the United States and the "quartet" in de-escalating the violence and in bringing the parties back to the negotiating table. Norway also supports the Arab League in promoting the Saudi Arabian peace initiative.

Norway deeply regrets losses of Israeli lives due to terrorism and acknowledges Israel's right to defend itself from acts of terrorism. However, Israel must comply with international law and ensure that Palestinian civilians do not become victims of Israeli self-defence measures.

The recent damage inflicted by the Israeli military attacks has caused the deepest concern in Norway. The humanitarian situation is very difficult indeed. Civilian institutions of the Palestinian Authority have been targeted. The Palestinian Authority's security infrastructure has been seriously damaged. The Palestinian economy is in a downward spiral. The Israeli military operations are not conducive to achieving peace.

Norway very much regrets that the Secretary-General was forced to disband the fact-finding team. We strongly believe that it would be in the interest of everybody — Palestinians, Israelis and the international community — to get the most accurate information possible concerning what happened in the refugee camp in Jenin.

The immediate challenge now is to rebuild the institutions of the Palestinian Authority, including the security infrastructure. Without a functioning Palestinian Authority and a Palestinian police force, there can be no progress in fighting terror and resuming negotiations. We are therefore pleased that a meeting of international donors in Oslo two weeks ago, under the auspices of the Ad Hoc Liaison Committee, produced strong and concrete commitments to the

democratically elected Palestinian leadership and to the rebuilding of Palestinian institutions. At the same time, donor assistance can only alleviate the economic and social hardships faced by the Palestinians. The key to ending those hardships lies with Israel, and the donors asked Israel to end the closures and to transfer the value-added tax withheld. Donors also decided to seek guarantees from Israel that no further damage will be done to projects financed by the international donor community.

However, real progress in the peace process can be achieved only if the root cause of the conflict is removed. The Israeli occupation must come to an end.

Norway calls on Israel and the Palestinians to act with responsibility and to move towards a political resolution to the conflict. It is time for the parties to adopt a constructive strategy. Norway calls on Israel to halt all its military operations immediately and to withdraw its forces from reoccupied Palestinian areas. President Arafat and the Palestinian Authority must do their utmost to stop Palestinian terrorism. In that regard, Israel must stop destroying the Palestinian police infrastructure, which undermines the long-term capability of the Palestinian Authority to fight terrorism. President Arafat must be allowed to resume his full duties as head of the Palestinian Authority.

Norway supports the idea of holding a peace conference this summer. Negotiations must be resumed with the aim of realizing the international consensus on the vision of two States, Israel and Palestine, living side by side within internationally recognized borders, in accordance with the relevant Security Council resolutions. The conflict will not end until the occupation comes to an end and the objective of two States is achieved. Ultimately, however, it is the parties themselves that bear the greatest responsibility in that regard. Peace in the Middle East is possible only if the parties are willing to take the necessary steps, which no doubt will involve concessions and compromises on both sides.

Mr. Lavrov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The situation in the Palestinian territories and in the Middle East as a whole has prompted serious concern on the part of the Government of the Russian Federation. Regrettably, we must note that, in spite of certain positive developments, the Palestinian-Israeli confrontation remains acute. People are dying on both sides, and the humanitarian crisis in the Palestinian territories has taken on catastrophic proportions, in which the entire economic infrastructure has been essentially destroyed. The civilian population's unprecedented suffering has caused extreme concern on the part of the entire international community. In order to normalize the situation, wide-ranging and varied efforts will be necessary. We believe that what is most important now is to halt immediately all acts of violence, including acts of terrorism, provocation, incitement and destruction.

That was precisely the focus of the meeting of the "quartet" of international mediators held in Washington, D.C., on 2 May, with the participation of the Secretary-General. The "quartet" came out strongly in favour of urgent collective action to restore peace to the Middle East region on the basis of the implementation of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967), 338 (1973) and 1397 (2002) and of the Saudi initiatives adopted at the Arab summit in Beirut. It is Russia's firm position that all Council resolutions must be implemented consistently; there can be no double standards.

In that context, we see no justification for the Israeli Government's refusal to accept the fact-finding mission to the Jenin refugee camp, established by the Secretary-General pursuant to resolution 1405 (2002). Despite repeated Security Council actions concerning Israel and the exhaustive clarifications provided by the Secretary-General with regard to the group's mandate, Israel did not implement resolution 1405 (2002). We believe that objective information about what took place in Jenin must be provided to the Council.

Moscow welcomed the news of the lifting of the siege on the residence of Yasser Arafat, head of the Palestinian National Authority, in Ramallah, and views that action as very positive and significant in the present complicated situation. Palestinians and Israelis must now take further steps to normalize that situation. First and foremost, this related to defusing the confrontation at the Church of the Nativity, fully withdrawing Israeli troops from the Palestinian Authority's territory, establishing a durable ceasefire and guaranteeing unhindered access of assistance to the Palestinian population. Also on that agenda is the adoption of urgent measures to restore the Palestinian Authority's institutions in their entirety and to overcome the humanitarian crisis.

There is no military solution to the conflict. It is Russia's firm position that future diplomatic efforts should be focused on finding practical ways to resolve the Middle East tragedy on the basis of the resumption of political negotiations. Russia, as a sponsor of the peace process and a participant in the "quartet" of international mediators, will continue to work actively to ensure a definitive Palestinian-Israeli settlement whose objective is the peaceful and secure good-neighbourliness of two States, Palestine and Israel. We think that that objective will be advanced by the forthcoming Middle East conference, scheduled for the beginning of summer. The decision that we are taking in the United Nations also calls for the fostering of further efforts in that direction.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

United Nations A/ES-10/PV.17

General Assembly
Emergency Special Session

Official Records

17th meeting
Tuesday, 7 May 2002, 3 p.m.
New York

President: Mr. Han Seung-soo ..... (Republic of Korea)

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

Agenda item 5 *(continued)*

Illegal Israeli actions in occupied East Jerusalem and the rest of the Occupied Palestinian Territory

Draft resolution A/ES-10/L.9

Mr. Zhang Yishan (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Middle East and Palestinian question have once again become the focus of international attention. Last March, Israel launched a large-scale military attack on Palestine, which led to a precipitous escalation of the conflict. As a result, the Security Council adopted resolution 1397 (2002) and resolution 1402 (2002).

However, in disregard of the authority of the Security Council, Israel has refused to comply with those resolutions and to withdraw from the Palestinian cities. Instead, it has expanded its military attacks, thus further aggravating the situation. Last month, under the pretext of combating terrorism, Israeli troops killed innocent civilians in the Jenin refugee camp and created a shocking humanitarian tragedy. Israel completely ignored the vigorous demands of the international community, went back on its own word and blocked the trip of the fact-finding team to Jenin.

We strongly oppose and condemn the Israeli attacks and aggression against Palestine, its refusal to implement Security Council resolutions and its attempts to block the fact-finding team's trip to Jenin.

History and reality have demonstrated once again that the Middle East question can be solved only in a peaceful manner, through dialogue and negotiations. The use of violence against violence leads nowhere; it can only further intensify mutual hatred and make it more difficult to achieve peace in the Middle East. Military means will not guarantee the security of Israel. Nor will the suicide bombings of a small number of people contribute to the fundamental interests and the just cause of the Palestinian people.

As neighbours, Israel and Palestine can only achieve peaceful coexistence through building up mutual confidence and trust. Therefore, we strongly urge Israel to cease immediately its military attacks, to lift its siege of the Church of the Nativity and to withdraw from the occupied Palestinian territories. At the same time, we hope that Israel and Palestine will achieve an immediate ceasefire, break the vicious cycle of violence and revive the peace talks as soon as possible.

The crux of the Middle East question is the question of Palestine. To achieve a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the Middle East question, it is necessary to restore all the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, including its right to an independent State on the basis of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and the principle of land for peace.

Last March, the Security Council adopted resolution 1397 (2002) and the Summit of the League of Arab States adopted a peace initiative based on the

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

02-37029 (E)

Saudi proposal. These actions have provided a framework and objectives for the achievement of a just, comprehensive and lasting settlement of the Middle East question. Those objectives include the restoration of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, the establishment of a Palestinian State, the guarantee of Israel's security, the peaceful coexistence of Palestine and Israel, the Israeli withdrawal from the Arab territories occupied since 1967 and the normalization of relations between Arab States and Israel.

Of course, many obstacles and difficulties still need to be overcome before those objectives can be achieved. Israel, Palestine and the international community should work together to achieve them. We hope that the Security Council and the United Nations will play a positive role in that regard.

At present, the Israeli military attacks on Palestine have seriously damaged the Palestinian Authority and the infrastructure of Palestine. The Palestinian people are faced with unprecedented economic difficulties and with a grave humanitarian situation.

We call upon the international community to provide emergency humanitarian aid and other assistance to Palestine. China has always attached importance to the question of the Middle East. Through telephone calls and mutual visits, Chinese leaders and concerned leaders of the Middle East countries have exchanged views on the situation in the Middle East and on the settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The Chinese Government and people have always supported the Palestinian and Arab people in their just cause.

President Arafat is the champion of the just cause of the Palestinian people and of their interests. Safeguarding his authority and that of the Palestinian Authority will contribute to easing tensions in the region and to promoting peace talks between Israel and Palestine.

China supports the efforts of the Secretary-General to ease tensions in the Middle East and to promote a political settlement. China is ready to work with other members of the international community to help ease current tensions in the Middle East and to promote an early, just, comprehensive and lasting settlement of the Middle East question.

Mr. Jerandi (Tunisia) *(spoke in Arabic)*: I should like at the outset, Mr. President, to express to you my sincere thanks and appreciation for your response to the request by the Arab Group and the Non-Aligned Movement to resume the tenth emergency special session to consider the dangerous situation prevailing in the occupied Palestinian territories, which constitutes a tangible threat to international peace and security.

Once again, we are resorting to the General Assembly in order to appeal to the conscience of the world, to clarify the Palestinian question, and to reiterate once again the purposes and principles of the United Nations, according to which the United Nations system is responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security — a collective responsibility that brooks no exemptions.

It is a source of deep concern that, despite the fact that the commitments undertaken by the membership of this Organization are clear, the Security Council has been unable to deal with the tensions in the Palestinian territories or to impose its resolutions. Also of concern is its paralysis in the face of the Israeli Government's intransigence, its refusal to abide by international legitimacy and its continued prevarication. These are simply delaying tactics aimed at gaining time and at enabling it to circumvent Security Council resolutions and to shirk its international responsibilities.

Along with the absence of political will and of respect for international law, the failure of the Security Council to shoulder the responsibilities entrusted to it by the Charter has become the norm, at a time when war criminals and the perpetrators of serious violations of international humanitarian law are not allowed impunity, since responsibility for this is no longer subject to questioning.

The fact that Israel has refused to accept the fact-finding team set up by the Secretary-General and supported by the Security Council in resolution 1405 (2002) — a team made up of eminent and impartial personalities — leads us to suspect that Israel is continuing to attempt to justify its actions and to state that no massacres or war crimes occurred in the Jenin refugee camp. Why then does it not accept this fact-finding team, if it wishes to prove that it has done nothing to contravene international humanitarian law?

The problem is clear and simple. Is Israel hiding something, and is it for that reason that it rejected the fact-finding team? Were massacres and war crimes perpetrated? The only way to determine this is to send a fact-finding team to the field so that it can report on what really happened. What happened at the refugee camp in Jenin and in many other Palestinian towns and villages is clear and established and should be dealt with under international humanitarian law, and in particular the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention.

The mass media — even the Israeli mass media — have carried news and shown images that have been confirmed by many eyewitnesses from Israeli and international non-governmental organizations and by agencies of the United Nations system in the field. What took place in Jenin was horrific and should fall under the purview of international law. Israel must prove through a fact-finding team, and no other mechanism, that it did not demolish dozens of houses, burying their inhabitants in the rubble; that it did not use Palestinian citizens as human shields when it attacked those houses; and that it did not refuse to help those in need who lost their lives because ambulances and medical teams could not reach them, nor could they go through checkpoints.

Israel must prove that it has not arrested doctors and nurses; that it has not gone into hospitals and taken the injured from operating rooms; that it did not, for three weeks, prevent journalists and representatives of the media from knowing what was going on inside the Jenin refugee camp.

Israel must prove the opposite of what many United Nations bodies have shown. It must prove that its soldiers have not contravened international humanitarian law and that they have not plundered the property of Palestinians. Many Israeli papers have reported this week that many Israeli soldiers and officers are now under questioning due to the transgressions and acts of violence they perpetrated against Palestinian civilians. If Israel is innocent of all charges, then the best thing for it to do is to allow the uncovering of what has occurred in the occupied Palestinian territories.

It is regrettable that the Security Council has not been able to enforce the implementation of its resolutions, in order to show that today crimes against humanity cannot be perpetrated without punishment or accountability. We cannot have selectivity when it comes to international responsibilities or anything that threatens international peace and security. The Council cannot apply double standards with respect to international humanitarian law.

It is a matter of international and humanitarian law, a moral issue and a measure of the credibility of the Security Council, everyone's final recourse.

The General Assembly today must take responsibility. The Charter gives the States Members of the United Nations the right to go to the General Assembly — a forum in which everyone is equal and which has a collective responsibility in the area of international peace and security, and in which no one is excluded or marginalized.

The General Assembly must condemn the Israeli actions against the Palestinian people, in particular those crimes committed in the Jenin refugee camp. It must condemn Israel for refusing to accept the fact-finding team set up by the Secretary-General, in violation of resolution 1405 (2002), which charged the Secretary-General with submitting a report containing the information available to him on the actions of the occupying forces in the Jenin camp and in many other Palestinian places.

The obstruction by the Israeli occupation forces of international efforts to find out what happened in Palestinian territory constitutes a very serious precedent in the context of the work of the United Nations. It is a problem that we should all address so that international law continues to be the only reference point for all countries, without discrimination or selectivity.

Mr. Wehbe (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): It gives me great pleasure to express to you, Mr. President, our heartfelt appreciation for swiftly responding to the request to reconvene the tenth emergency special session of the General Assembly on the situation in the occupied Palestinian territories. The delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic associates itself with the statement made by the brotherly delegation of Sudan on behalf of the Arab Group.

The Syrian Arab Republic has always made clear, in many statements and positions in the Security Council, that the Israeli Government's use of brutal methods that run counter to international humanitarian law do not have as their objective merely the

destruction of the infrastructure of the Palestinian people or of the will and determination of those people to resist the Israeli occupation. Their objective is the elimination of any glimmer of hope for a just and comprehensive peace in the region.

Israel wants to keep the region tense and at boiling point, so that it can do whatever it wants and continue to pursue its colonial settler policies — its policies of colonialism and occupation. Faced with this destructive Israeli invasion, the Security Council tried for over two months to adopt measures to deter Israel, to put an end to its acts of aggression against the Palestinians and to prevent it from killing so many innocent people. The Council adopted a number of resolutions, including 1402 (2002) and 1403 (2002), which call upon Israel to stop its attacks and to respect international legitimacy and international humanitarian law. The resolutions also called upon Israel to respond to the humanitarian needs of the Palestinian people, who are under siege in their homes, towns and villages, including their need for food and medicine.

Israel, however, ignored international law and relevant United Nations resolutions, proving once more that it does not respect the United Nations or its resolutions, or the will of the peoples of the world or the region in particular to bring about the peace that will guarantee an independent Palestinian State on Palestinian territory and the return of occupied Arab territories in the Golan, as well as those still under occupation in Lebanon.

The adoption of Security Council resolution 1405 (2002) was another response on the part of the international community to the crime committed by Israel in the Palestinian refugee camp in Jenin. If it were true that no crime had been committed, Israel would have accepted the deployment of a fact-finding mission. The Secretary-General made every effort to establish a fact-finding team, as provided for in resolution 1405 (2002), and to establish the team's terms of reference. But as usual, Israel immediately started to call into question the composition of the team. Israel started procrastinating, even though the team included highly qualified, eminent international personalities. It was headed by Mr. Ahtisaari, the former President of Finland, and included Mrs. Ogata, the former United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and Mr. Sommaruga, the former President of the International Committee of the Red Cross.

Israel began a local and global ca
it smeared the members of the team. I
question the team's mandate and tried
task, procrastinating, delaying the arr
and undermining the mandate with
entrusted under resolution 1405 (2002
abandoned all pretence and simply re
the team — an action we had expecte
beginning. As a member of the Co
upon the Council to avoid falling int
Israel by adopting a resolution support
the Secretary-General and directed to
Israeli defiance of Council resolutions.

The Israeli position has seriously
efforts of the Secretary-General. It
undermined the credibility of the Secu
Israelis tried in advance to call in
integrity of the eminent international
the team. It has become clear that S
resolutions are not necessarily enf
mandatory — for some countries, pa
which can resist or flout them, and e
with impunity.

The message sent by Israel is clea
tolerate any burden; it is not forced to
repeatedly defying the Security Coun
must pay dearly. Where is Israeli de
many meetings of the Security Counc
plenary meeting or in consultations —
Republic has stressed the need t
credibility of the Security Council and
resolutions.

Syria made every possible effor
Secretary-General in dispatching the t
to the occupied territories to investi
committed by Israel in all the cities a
West Bank and the Gaza Strip, inclu
crime committed in the Jenin refugee
also keen to preserve unity among C
and stressed the need to move forc
Council's authority is called into ques
attempts to circumvent it.

Given the Council's failure to ac
stressing its previous resolution 140
prove to the world that Israel should
law, we would like to say that history
curtain on the Jenin massacre without
facts and unmasking the brutal Israeli

the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territories, so that such carnage will not be repeated.

The General Assembly, entrusted with international peace and security through a mandate, is called upon today to send a clear message to the Israeli occupation authorities to abide by the legal responsibilities incumbent upon them for protecting civilians in times of war in accordance with the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949. The General Assembly, which represents the conscience of the international community, must strongly condemn the Israeli practices against the Palestinian people. It is also called upon to establish a mechanism that will guarantee that information is brought to light about the crimes committed in the Jenin refugee camp in particular, and in all other Palestinian towns and villages at the hands of the Israeli occupation authorities.

Today, those authorities entered the city of Tulkarm. They detained some people, and they left.

The United Nations cannot ignore Israel's crimes, particularly at a time when people all around the world have joined demonstrations against Israeli practices and crimes. No matter how much Israel tries to cover up its crimes, the United Nations cannot stand idly by while Israel defies international law and destroys efforts to achieve a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East. In particular, the initiative adopted at the recent Arab Summit in Beirut called for the establishment of an independent Palestinian State with Jerusalem as its capital. It also laid down a map defining the future of the peace process.

Mr. MacKay (New Zealand): Over the past weeks we have watched with growing alarm events in the occupied territories. We have watched the human tragedy unfold and have joined urgent international calls for the political commitment and action needed to halt the violence on both sides. For the lesson of the past half-century is that there is no security solution alone to this conflict. There can be no lasting peace without a political settlement.

With good reason, my Government has criticized the recent military operations and excessive use of force by the Israeli Defence Force in West Bank towns. Killing and injuring innocent civilians, destroying the Palestinian economy and eroding the capacity of the Palestinian Authority will only put back the peace process. The action has worsened the social and economic hardships faced by the Palestinian people. This strategy means that in the long term both sides lose.

Both sides also lose, and peace is further set back, by terrorist acts against Israeli citizens. We condemn all terrorist acts, including the appalling suicide bombings, which have claimed the lives of innocent Israelis. New Zealand abhors terrorism and has been quick to join international efforts to counter it.

We also know that dealing effectively with terrorism must include tackling underlying grievances across a broad front.

Recent reports by the Food and Agriculture Organization and international humanitarian agencies outline how the situation of the Palestinian people in many areas has deteriorated alarmingly. Clearly, innocent civilians are paying a heavy price. In view of the urgent need for humanitarian assistance and reconstruction, New Zealand last month made a special contribution of $400,000 towards the emergency relief appeal launched by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian Refugees.

We deplore also Israel's refusal to allow the Secretary-General's fact-finding team into the Jenin refugee camp. In so doing, and blocking this international scrutiny, Israel seems condemned by its own actions. It is also in violation of Security Council resolution 1405 (2002).

There is no shortage of plans to resolve this conflict. Rather, the need is for political leadership and courage from all parties to compromise and get the peace process back on track. A move forward politically requires an improved security situation. But, equally, achieving a reduction in the level of violence depends in part on there being a political process that holds out the prospect of genuine progress towards a peace settlement.

Conflicts are often best resolved primarily by the protagonists themselves. In this case, however, any semblance of trust or good will between the parties has been shattered. The conflict is long-standing and its resolution is vital to ensuring international peace and security. The international community must assist. The circumstances surrounding the welcome lifting of the siege on President Arafat's compound demonstrate the positive role the international community can play.

Beyond this, New Zealand supports a neutral third party mechanism under a Security Council

mandate to monitor a ceasefire — a prerequisite towards rebuilding trust between the two parties. New Zealand has already indicated that it would be prepared to contribute to such an international force, if there was a peace to keep.

New Zealand welcomes the recent Saudi initiative, which holds out an unprecedented prospect of normalizing relations between Israel and the Arab world. We welcome also plans to convene an international foreign ministers peace conference this summer, announced at the "quartet" meeting last week. Notwithstanding the recent setbacks, we applaud the initiatives of the Secretary-General towards achieving a lasting peace, and we remain convinced that the United Nations has an important role to play.

There is an urgent need for the leadership of both the Israeli and the Palestinian peoples to display good faith in returning to the peace process and to seek a durable solution based on respect for human rights and international law. The time has come for bold moves. We call on both parties to turn their backs on violence and to make commitments to a process aimed at achieving the durable peace for which we all so greatly hope, and which all Israelis and Palestinians so fully deserve.

Mr. Aldouri (Iraq) (*spoke in Arabic*): We would like to thank you, Mr. President, for your rapid response to the request for a resumption of the tenth emergency special session of the General Assembly, which has been convened at an extremely complicated time for the international community — particularly after the failure of the Security Council to implement its resolutions regarding the flagrant Zionist violations of the Charter of the United Nations that have threatened international peace and security. In view of that dangerous situation in the Security Council, the General Assembly must shoulder its responsibilities under the Charter to preserve international peace and security.

The Security Council has adopted several resolutions to cope with the war crimes and crimes against humanity that have been, and continue to be, perpetrated by the Zionist entity against our peoples in the Palestinian occupied territories, including Al-Quds Al-Sharif. However, that entity has failed to respect those resolutions and has even failed to respond to the invitation to end those crimes extended to it by its friends and the States that support it financially, military and morally. Moreover, that entity has committed further violations of international humanitarian law in full view of the international community.

Given those serious violations, the Security Council was obliged to adopt resolution 1405 (2002), which endorsed the initiative of the Secretary-General to develop accurate information regarding the events that took place in Jenin through a fact-finding team. The Zionist entity initially accepted the team and, with the exception of a few States, the entire world believed it. However, as expected by some parties, that entity engaged in procrastination and delaying tactics and presented unacceptable proposals to the Secretary-General and to others, including interfering with the membership of the team. Even before making those proposals to the Secretary-General, that entity refused to receive the team, and the team was eventually disbanded by the Secretary-General.

In our view, the fact that the Secretary-General was unable to deploy the fact-finding team confirms various things. First, it confirms the well-known tactics of the Zionist entity, endorsed and supported by the United States, vis-à-vis non-respect for the resolutions of the Security Council. Secondly, it confirms the failure of the Security Council to guarantee respect for its own resolutions — something that is due to the position of the United States, which dominates the Council. Thirdly, it confirms the Council's lack of cooperation with the Secretary-General in the implementation of resolution 1405 (2002) — again, due to the position of the United States. Fourthly, and due to one member's dominance over the fate of the Council, it reaffirms the Council's current policy of double standards and its selective approach to issues.

The Zionist entity was aware that the report of the fact-finding team could lead to its condemnation by the international community for perpetrating war crimes under international law and for violating international conventions regarding occupation and the treatment of peoples under occupation by occupying forces. That would have made the Zionist entity responsible for the crimes perpetrated during the invasion of Palestinian cities and refugee camps. The refusal to receive the fact-finding team was therefore a desperate attempt by that entity to cover up war crimes and crimes against humanity and acts of genocide in the occupied Palestinian territories.

The Zionist military aggression against Palestine will continue to threaten international peace and security because of the failure of the Security Council to adopt resolutions in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter, and because of the Zionist entity's refusal to implement resolution 1405 (2002). The General Assembly, in accordance with Articles 10, 11 and 14 of the Charter, can play a major role in guaranteeing international peace and security in the light of the failure of the Council. Given that failure to guarantee international peace and security, the General Assembly has an historic role to play to address that failure.

The General Assembly is therefore urged to request the Secretary-General to submit a report on the killings, acts of torture, arrests, displacement, siege, starvation, the destruction of houses over the heads of their occupants — including men, women, children and elderly persons — and the destruction of the Palestinian economic infrastructure. That report is to be based on the testimony of numerous sources — in particular when it comes to the current situation in destroyed Palestinian cities — and on the testimony and observations of both Palestinian and foreign witnesses. In addition, we also have the reports of audio and visual mass media.

The rules of international humanitarian law have spelled out the duties of States regarding their responsibility for observing and for ensuring respect for humanitarian norms. Under common article 1 of the four Geneva Conventions of 1949, all countries are obliged to abide by, and guarantee respect for, these Conventions. All countries must therefore undertake, both individually and collectively, appropriate measures to put pressure on the Zionist entity to oblige it to respect the Conventions.

In the light of all this, this emergency special session of the General Assembly should urge countries to implement the declaration on the Fourth Geneva Convention adopted on 5 December 2001, by putting in place national, regional and international measures to exert pressure on the Zionist entity to get it to respect the Convention and allow humanitarian organizations, under the leadership of the International Committee of the Red Cross, to play their role under international humanitarian law to extend humanitarian and medical assistance to the victims of the Zionist aggression in the occupied Palestinian territories.

Finally, my country believes that the Zionist entity's flouting of international law, in particular the United Nations Charter, and its attempts to interpret it subjectively and to use it as an instrument of aggression against the Palestinian people in one of the most ferocious crimes known in modern times, and without accountability, is a great detriment to established legal and international principles. The General Assembly must therefore be vigilant with respect to such flagrant behaviour and flouting of principles, the consequences of which will affect the entire world.

The President: I should like to draw members' attention to a revised draft resolution issued as document A/ES-10/L.9/Rev.1, which is now being distributed in the Hall.

Mr. Hidayat (Indonesia): May I begin by expressing my delegation's appreciation to you, Sir, for convening the tenth emergency special session of the General Assembly to consider the illegal Israeli actions in occupied East Jerusalem and the rest of the occupied Palestinian territory at a critical moment in the Middle East. Ever since 29 March, when the onslaught of Israeli military aggression began on the cities of Palestine and its legitimately chosen Government, Indonesia has remained profoundly concerned at the massive loss of human life and devastating material destruction.

Our meeting today is particularly relevant as we in the international community are about to speak resoundingly, unanimously and with moral clarity by adopting the draft resolution before us, in the light of the open debate in the Security Council last Friday in which the Council was once again stymied from taking any action in the strife-torn occupied territories. It is regrettable that the Security Council, as the only body mandated to maintain international peace and security, could not agree on follow-up action in response to Israel's refusal to cooperate with the fact-finding team, as called for in its resolution 1405 (2002), and which ultimately resulted in the disbandment of the team. This certainly brings to the forefront the question of the authority of the Council to implement its own resolutions and of its credibility, particularly when the failure to comply with them constitutes a continuing and glaring violation of international law and international humanitarian law. In view of this, an even more solemn responsibility rests with the General

Assembly to address the unfolding conflict and its ramifications.

First, it is incumbent on the international community to seek the true sequence of events in the Jenin refugee camp. The impediments placed by Israel on the fact-finding team should not deter the presentation of a report by the Secretary-General based on the available information and resources. Considering an aggression of this magnitude, we must ensure that justice and fairness prevail for the sake of all those Palestinian civilians who lost their lives and properties.

Secondly, the dire humanitarian situation in the occupied Palestinian territories demands that the occupying Power cease obstructing humanitarian agencies, including the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, from carrying out their mandates, particularly in a conflict situation such as the one at hand. The immense suffering of the civilian population is compounded by the denial of access to the most basic necessities of food and medicine. Therefore, Israel, as the occupying Power, must scrupulously abide by its obligations under the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Times of War of 12 August 1949.

Thirdly, there can be no short cut by addressing this conflict through a military solution and occupation. The logic of war can never subvert the rule of law and the will of an entire people to self-determination and independence. In my delegation's view, the road map towards the realization of two States, Palestine and Israel, living side by side within secure, internationally recognized borders, as contained in Security Council resolution 1397 (2002), can be achieved only through the cessation of violence, with the deployment of an international security force, and a return of the concerned parties to the peace negotiations on the basis of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and on the principle of land for peace.

Finally, anything less than this objective is bound to fail. Indeed, the volatility of the current crisis has fostered an awareness of the full extent of incalculable consequences for the region if peace and normalcy prove to be elusive. Against this backdrop, the General Assembly, as the universal representative body of the Organization, cannot and should not fail the people of Palestine and their just cause. It should remain vigilant and seized of this item until the attainment of a comprehensive peace in the Middle East region with the establishment of a sovereign and independent State of Palestine.

Mr. Khalid (Pakistan): The General Assembly is meeting today in an emergency session, which once again underscores the critical security situation in the Middle East. The situation has not only deteriorated sharply, but threatens to nullify all efforts to bring peace and stability to the region. Ignoring the international call and the Security Council's successive resolutions, Israel continues to invade Palestinian towns and cities, targeting the innocent civilian population. Never in the history of Palestine has the situation been so fragile and the need to respond more critical. With hopes of peace dashed, the peace process itself derailed and violence spiralling out of control, the lack of international pressure on the occupying Power has only led to the aggravation of an already precarious situation.

It will be recalled that, in our statement in December, we called for a meaningful dialogue based on justice and equity and in accordance with the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. We pleaded with the United Nations that it take a lead role in arranging such a dialogue. To our deep regret, all attempts to resurrect peace have been wrecked by deliberate and calculated politicking by Israel. Only last month, a proposal by the Secretary-General to dispatch a multinational force to the occupied Palestinian territories was blocked by Israel's intransigence. The proposal to send a non-partisan fact-finding mission to Jenin also met with a similar fate.

There is an emerging pattern of consistent Israeli rejection of all attempts to restart the peace process, in flagrant disregard of the will of the larger international community. We in Pakistan can well appreciate the agony of our Palestinian brothers, because a similar scenario exists in our own region, where Indian occupying forces continue to deny the right of self-determination to Kashmiri people in flagrant disregard of United Nations resolutions. There, as in the Middle East, the international community sits stands by helplessly in the face of the brutal and ugly use of force against an oppressed people.

The prospects for peace in the Middle East will remain bleak without the immediate cessation of all

acts of violence, provocation and destruction. The international community must not allow the present alarming state of affairs to continue. That state of affairs could permanently wreck the prospects for peace in the Middle East. The United Nations cannot afford to be a silent spectator when peace in one of the most volatile areas of the world remains so severely threatened.

The time has come to close this unpleasant chapter of conflict and misery and to open a new chapter of peace and co-existence on the basis of justice and equity. The framework for a settlement already exists in all the recent initiatives, in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967), 338 (1973) and 1397 (2002) and in the Beirut Declaration. A peaceful settlement of the question of Palestine is the only safe guarantee of a lasting peace in the Middle East. Distractions and gimmickry cannot succeed. The faithful implementation of all agreements is quintessential to preventing the situation from deteriorating into an abyss of further violence, instability and uncertainty. The international community, in particular the guarantors of the peace process, must use their influence to ensure full compliance with the peace agreements and all relevant Security Council resolutions.

Mr. Kuchinsky (Ukraine): I should like to begin by expressing my country's deep concern at the present situation in the Middle East and the continuation of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Despite the relative decrease in the level of violence during the past weeks, the international community now faces the dramatic challenges of overcoming the consequences of the recent military operation in the Palestinian territories.

On many occasions, Ukraine has stated its full condemnation and rejection of terrorism. However, Israel's actions to defend its citizens from acts of terror could in no way become a justification for the indiscriminate and disproportionate use of force against the Palestinian civilian population and the excessive destruction of private homes; of institutions of the Palestinian Authority, including security structures; and of the basic social services infrastructure. There could be no justification for imposing restrictions on the operations of humanitarian and medical personnel at a time when civilians were in great need of food, water and medicine. Such actions are unacceptable and constitute violations of international law, in particular humanitarian law.

Of special concern are the alarming reports concerning events in the Jenin refugee camp during the Israeli Defence Force's military operation earlier in April. Ukraine fully supported the Secretary-General's efforts to implement Security Council resolution 1405 (2002) and to send the fact-finding team into the field. We strongly deplore the Israeli Government's refusal to cooperate with the fact-finding team despite its earlier assurances to the contrary. We believe that the team's report, prepared in a professional manner, would have been in Israel's own interests, taking into account the assurances of its officials that "Israel has nothing to hide". In the absence of such reports, the international community and peoples all over the world will make their own assessments of what happened in Jenin, based on information from the press as well as from various humanitarian and human rights organizations. The failure of the Security Council to give its full support to the Secretary-General's efforts and to ensure full implementation of resolution 1405 (2002) has undermined that august body's credibility.

The current situation in the Middle East and in the Palestinian territories requires maximum mobilization and coordination of international diplomatic efforts — in particular those of the "quartet" and of the Arab nations — aimed at ending the violence and resuming peace negotiations on a final settlement. In that regard, we welcome the outcome of the recent "quartet" meeting in Washington, D.C., as well as the security arrangements brokered by the United States and the United Kingdom leading to the peaceful resolution of the situation around the Palestinian Authority's headquarters in Ramallah and to the end of the siege of its elected President, Yasser Arafat. Those encouraging developments must help to move the process forward.

Ukraine reaffirms its commitment to help to bring about a just, lasting and comprehensive peace in the Middle East. On 24 April, during his visit to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, the President of Ukraine, Leonid Kuchma, announced Ukrainian proposals within the framework of international diplomatic efforts aimed at a peaceful settlement in the Middle East; later, those proposals were also distributed as a document of the Security Council and the General Assembly. The Ukrainian proposals are based on the same comprehensive approach recently agreed by the "quartet" — namely, to address in parallel security, political and economic elements. We

also believe that the importance of confidence-building measures and of measures aimed at strengthening inter-ethnic tolerance should not be overlooked.

There is an urgent need to provide emergency humanitarian assistance to the population in the Palestinian territories as well as, over the longer term, to take the necessary measures to normalize the economic situation and to rebuild the Palestinian Authority's infrastructure. We urge Israel to provide full and unimpeded access to international humanitarian aid organizations. The closures should be lifted to allow for free movement of people and goods. Steps to be taken to ensure security for both Palestinians and Israelis have been clearly set out in resolutions 1402 (2002) and 1403 (2002) and should be promptly and fully implemented by the parties. They include the complete and immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from territories under the control of the Palestinian Authority and the achievement of an unconditional and mutual ceasefire to end all forms of violence, including acts of terrorism. The Palestinian Authority should take urgent and decisive action to end violence, prevent terrorist acts and stop the activities of terrorist networks. We expect that a non-violent solution will be found shortly to end the siege of the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem.

Ukraine supports the deployment of a multinational force to the Palestinian territories, which could ensure respect of the ceasefire and create favourable conditions for the resumption of political negotiations. A multinational force could also help to rebuild the credible and effective security structures of the Palestinian Authority. Ukraine stands ready to consider the possibility of taking part in the multinational force under the mandate of the Security Council.

At the same time, the international community should exert every effort to return the parties to the political process and to the commencement of negotiations on the establishment of the Palestinian State. The road-map for negotiations is clearly outlined in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967), 338 (1973) and 1397 (2002), as well as in the principle of land for peace and in the Arab peace proposals initiated by Crown Prince Abdullah of Saudi Arabia.

The final goal of the negotiations is also clear: realization of the vision of two States, Israel and Palestine, living side by side within secure, internationally recognized borders. A comprehensive Middle East settlement also requires the resumption of peace negotiations on the Israeli-Syrian and Israeli-Lebanese tracks, the normalization of relations between Arab States and Israel and a just solution of the problem of Palestinian refugees.

In this regard, Ukraine welcomes the efforts under way to convene an international conference, which, we hope, will mark an important step forward in the Middle East peace settlement. Ukraine has already offered its good offices to both parties, namely, to provide on its territory a venue and the conditions necessary for holding peace negotiations. It would also be ready to participate actively in the preparation of the conference and to contribute to its successful outcome.

Mr. Pamir (Turkey): Turkey aligns itself with the statement made by the representative of Spain on behalf of the European Union. In taking the floor, I wish to expound further the principal concerns of Turkey, given our unique position in the region.

It will be recalled that during the recent meetings of the Security Council, my delegation repeatedly expressed serious concern at the humanitarian situation in the occupied Palestinian territories. We deplored the tragedy that befell both peoples, explained our concerns about the way the Israeli military operations were conducted, emphasized the importance of their withdrawal from Palestinian cities and underlined the necessity of implementing Security Council resolutions 1402 (2002) and 1403 (2002) without delay.

More recently, at the open meeting of the Security Council on 3 May, we welcomed the lifting of the siege on Mr. Arafat's compound as a modest, but encouraging, development, and we expressed our hope that the current stand-off at the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem would be resolved peacefully. We are now happy to hear of new, positive developments in this respect concerning the withdrawal of Israeli troops.

I do not need to remind this audience of the clear and consistent stance of Turkey on terrorism. For us, there never was nor can there ever be any degree of acceptable terrorism or of leniency towards it. Our stance is as unequivocal as our determination to fight this scourge. It was with that understanding that we strongly condemned the heinous terrorist attacks, including the irredeemable suicide bombings against Israeli civilians. Controlling violence and preventing terrorism are first and foremost a moral obligation.

Failing in that obligation has always served the cause of the opponents of peace. Israel's right to assure its citizens' security is as legitimate as the Palestinians' aspiration to an independent State.

Turkey has always welcomed the tireless efforts of the international community — the Secretary-General at the forefront — to put an end to the sharply escalating conflict between Israel and Palestine. In that context, we recognize the importance of Mr. Annan's timely initiative for the deployment of a multinational force, to be composed of a coalition of the willing, which will hopefully receive sincere cooperation from both parties. Likewise, the Secretary-General's initiative to let the international community obtain accurate information about what really took place in Jenin was right. Yet, the attitude of the Israeli Government on this purely humanitarian issue has been regrettable. The Secretary-General had to disband the fact-finding team. We are disappointed by the failure of that initiative, hence the non-implementation of Security Council resolution 1405 (2002).

We welcomed the outcome of the recent meeting of the "quartet" held on 2 May 2002 in Washington, D.C. We note with great interest all three elements of a comprehensive strategy, including the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East this summer.

We must now take into account the strong desire of the vast majority of the international community, including the parties concerned, to escape from the existing quagmire. We therefore consider the prospect of an international conference to be a new window of opportunity — one we can hardly risk missing. As a matter of fact, throughout its ongoing diplomatic efforts, Turkey has actively emphasized the necessity of a new beginning. During his constant dialogue with the parties, the Turkish Foreign Minister, Mr. İsmail Cem, as early as 1 April, forwarded Turkey's long-term assessment of the ongoing developments in the region and emphasized the need for drawing up a concrete project to bring an end to occupation, violence and terror in the Middle East, on the basis of a comprehensive solution. With that objective in mind, Mr. Cem proposed to the parties and the interested countries that they come together as soon as possible and take a bold new step on the basic parameters that will lead to peace.

It is evident enough that each wasted moment robs nothing less than the future of forthcoming generations. I would therefore like to take this opportunity to express from this podium my Government's readiness, and our firm belief in our capacity, to contribute to help reviving the peace process. Trust between the parties has been sorely missing, and the only way to reinstate this basic element is through negotiation. We are in need of a springboard that will thrust all the interested parties into serious and result-oriented talks, and an international conference remains the only plausible way to achieve that.

It is with this frame of mind that Turkey is about to vote in favour of the draft resolution entitled "Illegal Israeli actions in Occupied East Jerusalem and the rest of the Occupied Palestinian Territory".

Before doing so, we wish to ensure that not a modicum of doubt remains that, given their strong ties to the region and their historic relations with both the Jewish and Arab nations, the Turkish people felt deeply and shared the sorrow caused by each and every death. We will always abhor acts of terrorism and be concerned about the excessive use of force, as these radicalize large segments of a population. In this vein, we note with great concern the destruction of Palestinian cities and infrastructure. This is all the more reason for the parties and the international community to seek to do everything in their power resolutely to move away from the vicious circle of violence and retribution and start, at long last, healing the wounds.

The time has come for the world to declare its vision in all sincerity — a vision in which peace reigns, and the Israeli and Palestinian States live side by side.

Exactly half a year ago, from this rostrum, we told the international community that it was only through the resumption of peace talks that we could expect to see a lasting and comprehensive agreement and that each side should do its utmost to prevent violence and show restraint.

Sadly, our concerns proved to be right.

We hope to be able to speak of improved and concrete prospects for peace when we next take the floor, and we call upon both parties to show statesmanship and act with vision, as is incumbent upon them at this historic juncture. We call also on the

international community to contribute in a concrete and sincere manner to the resumption of the peace process.

Mr. Hasmy (Malaysia): My delegation would like to express its appreciation to you, Mr. President, for convening this resumed tenth emergency special session of the General Assembly to consider the grave situation in Palestine. This meeting has been requested by the Chairman of the League of Arab States and the Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement, following the failure of the Security Council to give the necessary follow-up support to the Secretary-General's initiative to dispatch a fact-finding mission to Jenin, which led to the disbanding of the team, which Malaysia deeply regrets.

This emergency special session would not have been necessary at all if the Council had carried out its Charter-mandated responsibility and effectively handled the issue. Given the ineffectiveness of the Council, it is incumbent upon the General Assembly, through this resumed emergency special session, to pronounce itself on the very serious situation in Palestine, which has grave implications for regional peace and security.

The Permanent Observer of Palestine, Ambassador Nasser Al-Kidwa, this morning informed the Assembly of the latest development on the ground. He also clearly presented the case pertaining to the atrocities committed against his people by the Israeli Defence Forces in the occupied Palestinian territory, particularly in Jenin. The situation remains tense and potentially explosive, in the wake of the ruthless military onslaught unleashed by Israel, which brought death and destruction to vast numbers of Palestinians.

The plight of the Palestinian people remains dire. The economy is devastated, buildings and houses lie in ruins as if they had been hit by a major earthquake, the infrastructure is in shambles, and the people are utterly dismayed and traumatized by the continued excessive and disproportionate use of military force by the occupying Power. The civilized world can no longer ignore the situation and maintain its equanimity in the face of the inhumane treatment of the Palestinian people, especially over these past few weeks.

My delegation extends its strong and unqualified support for the draft resolution introduced by the Permanent Representative of South Africa on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. Malaysia associates itself fully with the firm and unambiguous statement of the Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement. We are one of the many sponsors of the draft resolution, and we would urge other delegations also to become sponsors in overwhelming numbers to register their disapproval of Israel's actions. The atrocities carried out by the Israeli forces, including reports of possible war crimes committed by them in the Jenin refugee camp, must not be allowed to go unpunished.

Israel must be compelled to cooperate with the United Nations and the international community in ascertaining the facts behind the atrocities committed in Jenin. The reasons given by Israel for rejecting the fact-finding mission are bogus and unreasonable and should have been rejected out of hand by the Security Council. The efforts by Israel to torpedo the fact-finding mission — which, unfortunately, were successful — can be explained only as a transparent attempt to conceal the truth. This is clear from the concern it has expressed in respect of the accountability of those of its soldiers who took part in the Jenin operation, in any investigation of the Jenin atrocity.

If Israel is a responsible and law-abiding member of the international community, it will have to extend its fullest cooperation to the fact-finding mission and subject its soldiers who might have committed war crimes in Jenin to full accountability under international law. Its refusal to cooperate in the investigation of the facts will cast more than a long shadow on its credibility and standing as a Government and as a people in the eyes of the international community.

This resumed emergency special session serves an important purpose. It is not a propaganda exercise against Israel; it is aimed at propagating the justness of the Palestinian cause and represents a defence of the rights of the Palestinian people, who have gone through unimaginable hardships, humiliation and indignities for so long. The international community cannot afford to sit on the fence, to be "neutral", for there is no neutrality when fundamental human rights are being systematically violated and the legitimate right for freedom and independence of a people ruthlessly suppressed by an occupying colonial Power. To be silent in these circumstances is to excuse policies and practices that are inhumane and inexcusable.

Continued inaction by the international community would send the wrong message to Israel:

that its policies and practices are condoned or tolerated by the international community. These policies and practices have not advanced the cause of peace in the region. On the contrary, left unchecked, they have only emboldened Israel to tighten its grip on the occupied Palestinian lands, whetted its rapacious appetite for the illegal construction of more settlements and for the ruthless exploitation of Palestine's scarce natural resources for Israel's own use — all of which contravene the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949.

The search for peace between conflicting parties is a two-way process, a partnership based on good faith. It cannot be pursued in isolation. A solution cannot be arbitrarily imposed, and therefore it is essential for Israel to engage the Palestinian people through their elected representatives. Inasmuch as the Palestinians will have to deal with Mr. Sharon, the Prime Minister of Israel, whom they strongly distrust, Israel will have to deal with President Arafat, the democratically elected and indisputable leader of the Palestinian people, whether it likes him or not. It cannot hope to choose a leader with whom to dialogue over and above the heads of the Palestinian people. Israel should therefore stop demonizing Mr. Arafat, with all the negative propaganda that is being churned out against him, and begin engaging him in a serious and constructive dialogue, which is the only basis for a lasting solution to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

Many fine and eloquent statements have been made in the Assembly today and in the past on the question of Palestine, and many more will, doubtless, be made in the future. Similarly eloquent statements have been made in the Security Council. Indeed, so much has been said on the subject that many times we end up repeating ourselves. Yet speak we all must, for the sake of the hapless Palestinian people, for the sake of justice and humanity, for the sake of our own sense of self-respect, in the hope that, by sheer dint of repetition, our message will eventually be heard by the Government and the people of Israel.

What is this message? It is that enough is enough: enough death and destruction for the Palestinian people; enough harassment of civilians — of women, children and the aged; enough suppression of their rights; enough demolition of their homes and bulldozing of their farms; enough construction of illegal settlements on Palestinian lands; enough intimidation and bullying of Palestinian civilians by soldiers and settlers in the name of security; and enough of the longstanding occupation of Palestinian lands. That message must be said loud and clear, and repeated again and again, by all who cherish civilization and love and respect their fellow humans beings, in the hope that it will make a difference to the people of Palestine and promote the cause of peace.

Mr. Valdés (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): Allow me to thank you, Mr. President, for your initiative in holding this open debate about a conflict whose development and specific ramifications make it impossible today to remain indifferent towards. It is for that reason that Chile wanted to join other voices in this Hall today to express its deep concern at the violent state of affairs in Israel, Palestine and the occupied territories in which both peoples have suffered the loss of innocent life.

My country welcomes the positive developments in the conflict in recent days, a conflict to which it believes there is no military solution. The progress made would not have been possible without the dedicated efforts undertaken by the international community —especially those made by the Secretary-General, the Security Council and the "quartet" — towards just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

Nevertheless, there is one fact clouding our cautious optimism. Four resolutions on this issue have been adopted by the Security Council in the course of recent weeks, namely, resolutions 1397 (2002), of 12 March; 1402 (2002), of 30 March; 1403 (2002), of 4 April; and, finally, 1405 (2002), of 19 April. None of them is optional, and all of them contain clear and specific terms of reference. All of them have been ignored in turn. My country maintains that free interpretation of, or disregard for, the resolutions adopted by the Security Council affects the national dignity of all Members of the Organization and diminishes the credibility and effectiveness of the work of the United Nations in playing its role as the guarantor of international peace and security.

We therefore appeal to the Government of Israel to halt its military operations in Palestinian territories, to declare an immediate and effective ceasefire and to withdraw its troops completely from all Palestinian cities and from areas under the control of the Palestinian Authority. The occupation must end and give way to peaceful coexistence between two

independent States — Israel and Palestine — within secure and internationally recognized borders.

Chile has vigorously condemned the atrocity of terrorist attacks committed against the civilian population in Israel, but it equally condemns the serious humanitarian situation that has resulted from the Israeli invasion of Palestinian cities and camps. Particularly serious are the events that have taken place in the Jenin refugee camp. As pointed out in Security Council resolution 1405 (2002), those events require a detailed and complete investigation. The lack of a timely and objective report has given rise to doubts and hampers the reconciliation process. Our strict compliance with the norms of international law has led us to express our unease and concern at the lack of clarification of events that cast a pall over the situation and that require an immediate response in accordance with the international community's obligation to ensure respect for human rights and to protect civilian populations from the disproportionate use of force, regardless of the objective pursued.

Chile reiterates the need for a just, lasting and comprehensive peace in the Middle East based on resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and the principle of land for peace. In the same vein, we emphasize the essential role of the Palestinian Authority, which continues to be the legitimate and indispensable party for peace and which must be fully retained. In that context, we welcome the recent security agreements concluded by the United States, the United Kingdom and both parties that make possible greater freedom for President Arafat to be able to exercise his political leadership, thereby making it possible for him to take better actions in preventing acts of terrorism.

Given the prospect of a new international conference to deal with the situation in the Middle East and the Palestinian question, my country urges the Government of Israel and the Palestinian Authority to restore the minimal conditions of mutual respect necessary for their participation in the forthcoming negotiations to take place on an equal footing. We therefore endorse the scope of the statements made by Secretary-General Kofi Annan with regard to the conflict. We fully agree that the main problems to be resolved are the illegitimate occupation of land by the State of Israel, the need to end acts of violence and terror, and the prompt solution of the economic deprivation of the Palestinian people. Similarly, once the necessary confidence measures have been established between the parties, political, security and economic problems should be addressed as a whole, as they are interrelated.

Chile believes that efforts towards peace must be overseen with a degree of vigilance commensurate with the complexity of the situation. The criteria proposed by the Secretary-General with regard to the deployment of a multinational force on the ground deserve our full support.

Mr. Satoh (Japan): It is very regrettable indeed that the fact-finding team that was to be dispatched in order to develop accurate information about the events in the Jenin refugee camp had to be disbanded because the Government of Israel objected to receiving it. On the other hand, the fact that Chairman Arafat, the elected leader of the Palestinian people, has regained his freedom thanks to a combination of persuasion by the Governments of the United States and the other countries concerned and the United Nations and of the efforts made by both the Israeli and Palestinian authorities, and the fact that the confrontation in Bethlehem is said to be close to resolution for the same reason are very encouraging.

Nevertheless, the situation in the Middle East continues to be in a state of crisis. The international community has the urgent task of ending the vicious cycle of violence and retaliation that has been repeated since the fall of 2000, and of resuming a political process that will make it possible for two States — Israel and Palestine — to coexist peacefully within secure and recognized borders.

The Government of Japan has consistently supported the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, including their right to establish an independent State, as well as the right of the Israeli people to live in peace within secure and recognized borders. Moreover, for the purpose of restarting the political process between the two parties, the Government of Japan has repeatedly called upon Israel to withdraw immediately from the Palestinian-controlled territories, and upon the Palestinian side to strengthen the necessary measures to stop terrorist actions.

Furthermore, the Government of Japan considers that, in order to place the political process for ensuring peaceful coexistence between Israelis and Palestinians on a smooth track, it is important to pursue in several

areas concurrent efforts necessary to ensure lasting peace in the Middle East in a way that involves the international community. In that regard, the proposal regarding a multi-layered process recently announced by the Japanese Foreign Minister, Miss Yoriko Kawaguchi, in particular advocates pursuing the following three efforts simultaneously.

First, with a view to ensuring steady progress in the political process, that proposal calls for holding an international conference to internationally guarantee a ceasefire agreement and affirm the goals of the peace process, especially that of achieving the independence of a Palestinian State. Secondly, in order to assist efforts to restore peace, the proposal calls for strengthening the international community's cooperation for the stability and prosperity of the Middle East by resuming multilateral consultations to promote cooperation projects in the region. Lastly, the proposal calls for building a broad relationship of trust between Israelis and Palestinians.

The Government of Japan is prepared to play an active role in each of those three efforts. It supports the idea of an international conference, as presented by United States Secretary of State Colin Powell following the "quartet" meeting held in Washington, D.C., on 2 May. The Japanese Government is prepared to participate actively in the discussions to prepare the conference. In addition, for the purpose of confidence-building between Israelis and Palestinians, the Government of Japan is prepared to host a forum, not limited to government officials, in which a broad range of interested individuals from both sides will discuss a way for Israelis and Palestinians to coexist peacefully and a vision of a future Palestinian State.

Another important task that the international community must urgently tackle in the present situation is the alleviation of the extremely difficult humanitarian emergency the Palestinians are facing. To that end, the Government of Japan has recently decided to extend approximately $3.3 million in emergency humanitarian assistance to Palestinians through the United Nations Development Programme. Also, in response to the emergency appeal of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, the Japanese Government intends to extend assistance in the medical and health field, amounting to approximately $1.2 million. Moreover, we are studying the possibility of extending additional humanitarian assistance.

The support and cooperation of the international community is important to a resolution of the Middle East problem. In particular, experiences to date show that an active role by the Government of the United States is an essential catalyst for peace in the Middle East. For its part, the Government of Japan is also determined to make every possible effort to achieve our common goals. However, what is most important is for the parties to the conflict to exert the necessary self-restraint and to take the required political decisions. Recognizing that fact, I would like to conclude my statement by once again calling upon the leaders of the Government of Israel and the Palestinian Authority to make every possible effort to resume their dialogue.

Mr. Balzan (Malta), Vice-President, took the Chair.

Mr. Niehaus (Costa Rica) (*spoke in Spanish*): I am pleased to speak at the tenth emergency special session of the General Assembly on behalf of the member countries of the Rio Group.

The recent events in the Middle East have been a source of considerable concern for the members of the Rio Group. On 12 April 2002, our heads of State, meeting at San José, expressed their deep concern over the serious deterioration of the situation in the Middle East and the spiral of violence in which the Israeli and Palestinian peoples find themselves. Those feelings are even more strongly felt today.

The Rio Group would like to express its grave concern over the humanitarian situation and the violation of the fundamental human rights of both the Palestinian and Israeli civilian populations. The Rio Group vigorously condemns acts of violence, terrorism, provocation, incitement and destruction — in particular indiscriminate suicide bombings, which cause loss of life and suffering to, again, both the Israeli and Palestinian civilian populations. The Rio Group urges the parties to cease these acts immediately and to fully respect international humanitarian law.

The member countries of the Rio Group fully endorse Security Council resolution 1397 (2002), which envisages a region in which viable States of Israel and Palestine can live independently, in safety and democratically side by side, within secure and recognized borders. The Rio Group calls for immediate compliance with Security Council resolutions 1402 (2002) and 1403 (2002). At the same time, the Group regrets the fact that it has not been possible for

resolution 1405 (2002) — which provided for the visit of a fact-finding mission to the Jenin refugee camp to produce an impartial and credible report on the events that took place there — to be implemented. In that regard, we thank the Secretary-General for his outstanding efforts to ensure cooperation by the parties, reflected in his letter of 1 May, while we welcome and understand his reasons for disbanding the fact-finding team. The Rio Group urges the parties immediately to agree on a ceasefire and to return to the negotiating table.

The countries I represent fully endorse the actions and measures adopted by the United Nations to achieve a just and lasting solution, as well as the peace and mediation efforts of the "quartet" to resolve the conflict. In this context, the Rio Group supports the convening in the coming months of a ministerial conference on the situation in the Middle East in order to reactivate political negotiations. Our Group trusts that the action of the General Assembly will be part of that concerted and constructive effort to revive the peace process.

The Rio Group calls on the parties to restore security for the civilian population and to allow for the provision of indispensable humanitarian assistance. The Rio Group reiterates the appeal made by its heads of State on 12 April to the Government of Israel immediately to withdraw from Palestinian cities and to respect the integrity of the Palestinian Authority, headed by Yasser Arafat.

The Rio Group wishes to reiterate its desire to cooperate with the rest of the international community in achieving a just and lasting solution to the conflict.

Mr. Al-Hussein (Jordan) (*spoke in Arabic*): I should like at the outset to thank the President for his cooperation in convening this meeting of the tenth emergency special session of the General Assembly to consider the deteriorating situation in the occupied Palestinian territories, following the recent Israeli storming of territory under the control of the Palestinian Authority, which started on 29 March and is still in effect.

The latest developments in the occupied Palestinian territories are well known to all. If they demonstrate anything, it is the inability of the international community to face up to an occupying Power that violates all the major norms and shared principles controlling relations between civilized nations of the international community, including the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, which Israel accepted and promised to implement when it joined the Organization. The Israeli Government and its military apparatus are fully aware that their killing, destruction, and excessive and disproportionate use of force against an unarmed people and its official, civil and religious institutions are flagrant violations of its commitments under international humanitarian law, including the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949. This has plunged the entire region into a very serious crisis that threatens international peace and security.

In response to the current situation, Arab States have called on the Security Council to assume its responsibilities with respect to the ongoing conflict. The Security Council has adopted successive resolutions calling on Israel to cease violating the United Nations Charter and international humanitarian law and undermining the bases for a peaceful political settlement of the question of the Middle East. Following the adoption of each of these resolutions, the Israeli response was to directly and immediately violate the provisions of every one, starting with its rejection of resolution 1402 (2002); continuing with its incursions into occupied Palestinian territories and its siege of the headquarters of President Yasser Arafat, the legitimate and elected leader of the Palestinian people; and ending with its rejection of resolution 1405 (2002) and the fact-finding mission constituted on the basis of instructions from the Secretary-General to implement that resolution.

The Jordanian Government, in welcoming the diplomatic and political efforts of all parties — including the Secretary-General, the European Union, the United States and the Russian Federation — to convince Israel to respect Security Council resolutions, to withdraw its forces and to seek a peaceful political settlement of the conflict, expresses its profound regret that the Security Council has shirked its responsibilities under the Charter by allowing Israel to reject and violate its resolutions, as if it were above the law. In the light of all this, the Arab Group and the Non-Aligned Movement have turned to the General Assembly to restore the balance and to redress the inequities resulting from the Security Council's inability to fulfil its principal task of maintaining peace and security in the Middle East and to halt Israeli aggression against the Palestinian people.

The international community, as represented by the General Assembly, should not accept this situation or fail to take appropriate action to address Israel's position, which violates the fundamental rights of the Palestinian people and justifies collective punishment on the pretext of self-defence. Those who hold this position forget that the argument of self-defence has certain preconditions. Self-defence must come in response to an attack from another country and not be unleashed against an entire people that has been under military occupation for decades. The question arises: Who would defend himself in this situation? The occupying Power or the occupied people?

Given the current situation, the Jordanian Government calls on the General Assembly to reaffirm its previously stated positions vis-à-vis the question of the Middle East in support of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination; to free itself from Israeli occupation; to establish its independent State with its capital, Jerusalem; and to achieve a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East. We also call on the General Assembly to adopt a resolution expressing the will of the international community and the importance of respect for Security Council resolutions 1402 (2002) and 1403 (2002) on the recent Israeli reoccupation of Palestinian territories. As a result of the Council's failure to take the appropriate action with respect to the implementation of resolution 1405 (2002) and to the fact-finding mission on the events in Jenin, due to the Israeli rejection, the Government of Jordan calls on the General Assembly to request the Secretary-General to submit a report in order to establish the truth of recent events in Jenin.

Mr. Stuart (Australia): Let me be brief. We have substantive concerns about the draft resolution submitted in document A/ES-10/L.9. Australia supports Security Council resolution 1405 (2002), which welcomed the Secretary-General's initiative to dispatch a fact-finding mission to Jenin. We regret that the parties were unable to reach agreement to enable the mission to proceed. We have also repeatedly emphasized our concern over the humanitarian situation in the Palestinian territories. The Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Downer, announced on 2 May the commitment of an additional $1 million in humanitarian assistance there.

Nevertheless, despite our deep distress at the current situation and our desire to support the parties to achieve an immediate end to violence and an early return to negotiations, the current resolution, with its inflammatory language, is unhelpful and unbalanced and does not contribute to a peaceful resolution of the situation in the Middle East. Therefore, Australia is unable to support it.

Mr. Kasemsarn (Thailand): Let me begin by commending you, Mr. President, for convening the resumed 10th emergency special session of the General Assembly. This meeting is timely in view of the continuing crisis and of the recent events in the Middle East.

I should like to state where Thailand stands. Thailand unwaveringly condemns all acts of violence — in particular those against civilians, including women and children — and all acts of terror perpetrated by any party. Such actions must stop immediately if peace is to have a chance in the Middle East. We strongly urge all parties concerned to exercise maximum restraint and to immediately end the spiralling cycle of violence.

Thailand believes that a comprehensive and enduring political settlement through peaceful negotiations is the only means to achieve a lasting, comprehensive and just solution in the Middle East. We support relevant international efforts to help bring about such a solution. In that regard, we salute the Secretary-General in his tireless efforts to facilitate the establishment of conditions conducive to peace. We urge all parties to implement fully all relevant Security Council resolutions, including the recent resolutions 1397 (2002), 1402 (2002), 1403 (2002) and 1405 (2002). We support the initiative of His Royal Highness Crown Prince Abdullah of Saudi Arabia, which was endorsed at the Arab League's Beirut Summit. As a member of the Non-Aligned Movement, Thailand would also like to recall the decisions reached on this matter by the Ministerial Meeting of the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement held recently in Durban.

The most pressing issue at this juncture is the dire humanitarian situation in the occupied Palestinian territories. We are deeply concerned at the immense humanitarian implications of this crisis. We therefore hope that humanitarian and medical agencies will be given unhindered access to address the humanitarian problems there. Thailand also hopes that the military operations will be halted as soon as possible.

We welcome some positive developments that provide a ray of hope for the resolution of the turmoil. We welcome the fact that Chairman Arafat, head of the Palestinian Authority, is now free to travel in the West Bank and Gaza. As the elected leader of the Palestinian people, he remains a relevant partner in any political settlement process. We also welcome preliminary reports that an agreement has been reached for peacefully ending the standoff in the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem, a place of worship of great religious and historical significance. I should also like to take this opportunity to welcome the efforts of the "quartet", in particular the latest initiative in Washington, D.C., unveiled by Secretary of State Powell, which outlined the elements for a peaceful solution to the crisis in the Middle East.

All these developments should help lay the groundwork for rebuilding confidence and for getting the peace process in the Middle East back on the right track once again. It is our hope that these efforts, in tandem with other international efforts, will bear fruit so that there will be peace in our generation for all peoples in the Middle East. They deserve nothing less.

Mr. Shihab (Maldives): In the past few weeks, we have all watched the situation in Palestine spin out of control. The deadly forces unleashed by the Israeli war machine have savagely brutalized the unarmed Palestinian population, with virtually no regard for loss of human life. We strongly condemn the brut attacks — the indiscriminate shelling, the bombardment and the use of excessive force. That military approach and the economic suffocation of the Palestinian people are aimed solely at dealing a death blow to the prospects for a Palestinian State. Israel's aim is to destroy completely the Palestinian National Authority's infrastructure and to render President Arafat irrelevant, abandoning the peace process. The successes of the past decade in moving towards a peaceful settlement have now been mercilessly razed to the ground. Israel has broken the accords reached between the two sides and pushed the region to the brink of war.

We condemn Israel's defiant policies and its continued refusal to heed the demands of the Security Council and of the international community. Israel must not be allowed to act with impunity. It is incumbent upon the international community to make every effort to ensure that Israel complies with resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), as well as with resolutions 1402 (2002) and 1405 (2002).

Clearly, there is no alternative to peace. A militaristic approach will not lead to a peaceful solution. My country is therefore convinced that the path to peace lies solely in political dialogue and negotiations. The current situation in the region underscores the futility of opting for a battlefield solution.

The Maldives has consistently supported the just struggle of the Palestinian people to regain their homeland. The legitimate right of the Palestinian people to establish a State of their own cannot be usurped, as it has been recognized by the entire international community. That right must be restored sooner rather than later in the interest of wider peace and greater prosperity. Israel must withdraw from all occupied Palestinian and Arab territories and must honour resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and the principle of land for peace. It must accept the existence of two States, as envisaged in resolution 1397 (2002).

The Maldives welcomes the recent Saudi peace initiative that was endorsed by the Arab Summit in Beirut. That initiative presents the two parties with an opportunity unprecedented in the history of the Arab-Israeli conflict. My country also recognizes, in particular, the efforts of the "quartet" to move the parties back to the negotiating table under trying rcumstances.

The situation in Palestine has never been at a more critical and precarious stage. The international community must act — and act now — to ensure that the current escalation of violence is reversed, paving the way for permanent and lasting peace in the region. We believe that the co-sponsors of the peace process, especially the United States, must remain actively engaged and must help direct the parties towards cooperation and away from confrontation.

The Maldives reaffirms its solidarity with the Palestinian people, and it stands ready to contribute in whatever way it can to the international community's efforts to restore the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and in the search for peace in the region.

Mr. Valdivieso (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): Colombia thanks you, Mr. President, for your leadership in resuming this emergency session of the

General Assembly even while we regret the reasons for its resumption.

As a member of the General Assembly, we believe that we bear a special responsibility to respond effectively and immediately in those cases where, for certain complex political circumstances, the Security Council finds itself unable to achieve a result with respect to the conflict between Israel and Palestine in the Middle East, a situation which clearly constitutes a threat to international peace and security.

The specific case of the impossibility of implementing Security Council resolution 1405 (2002) in the terms presented by the Secretary-General to the President of the Security Council on 1 May is a political occurrence that has challenged the Council's authority and which we should condemn, as we have said on a number of occasions in the Council.

Colombia, as a member of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Rio Group, endorses the statements made on behalf of those groups by the Ambassadors of South Africa and Costa Rica, respectively. We do not need to reiterate many of the viewpoints expressed in those statements, but it is essential to present some considerations which we wish to express in our national capacity on the issue before us today.

Since the last occasion of the resumption of the tenth emergency special session of the General Assembly, in December 2001, we have witnessed a systematic deterioration of the situation in the Middle East. As is fitting for a series of events of great seriousness, the Security Council reacted in a timely fashion and always maintained its cohesion and unity. Columbia emphasizes that many of its actions have been politically relevant.

Security Council resolution 1397 (2002) includes a political vision of great importance, one deserving of the General Assembly's protection. We hope that our activities will strengthen the concept of a region in which two States, Israel and Palestine, live side by side within secure and recognized borders. We must collectively aspire to achieving that goal.

Meanwhile, Security Council resolution 1402 (2002) has shown the path that, if pursued, would greatly contribute to building trust between the parties so that peace negotiations could be resumed in the future. It is regrettable that the resolution, like many others adopted by the Council, has not yet been fully implemented by the parties.

In the same line of successful actions, the Council adopted resolution 1405 (2002), convinced that Israel would cooperate with the fact-finding team on recent events in Jenin. We were surprised by the subsequent reaction of the Israeli Government to that resolution. Far from being a threat to its vital interests, the fact-finding team, which Israel claimed had a United Nations bias against it, represented an excellent opportunity to find out the truth of what occurred. The team's observations would have had the firm support of the entire international community and would have had a desirable political effect for both parties.

The Security Council has taken action. Unfortunately, the difficulty in responding to events subsequent to the adoption of resolution 1405 (2002) has cast a shadow over the Council's prior sensible actions.

We have taken due note of the results of the recent meeting of the "quartet" held in Washington last week. We believe that the General Assembly could, at the appropriate time, welcome the proposal to convene an international conference on the Middle East. However, we hope that those efforts, deserving of all our support, will underline the need to resolve the grave humanitarian crisis in the occupied territories and the international community's need to reach a solid compromise for the reconstruction and development of those territories and for the strengthening of the institutions of the Palestinian Authority.

Mr. Pak Gil Yon (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The recent Israeli military assault on Palestinian cities and on the Palestinian Authority is attracting world attention. People in Arab States, including Palestine, are now undergoing bitter suffering, and the Middle East peace process is being gravely challenged by the reckless military actions of Israel. Anyone who feels responsibility for the survival and future of humankind will not turn aside from such tragedy on the globe.

There are big and small countries in the world, but there cannot be senior or junior countries. There are developed and less developed nations, but there cannot be dominating nations and nations destined to be dominated. All countries and nations are entitled to independent and equal rights as equal members of the

international community, regardless of the size of their territories and the level of their development.

Nevertheless, Israel has blamed the Palestinian leader, Yasser Arafat, for the aggravated situation in the Middle East, imposed a closure on him and tried to bury him politically. Israel has blocked Ramallah and curbed all the activities of President Arafat. That is, in fact, a gross encroachment upon the sovereignty of Palestine.

In international relations, it is unjustifiable to act as one pleases and to impose a siege on the leader of a nation and abridge his freedom to engage in political activities. The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea bitterly denounces such military attacks by Israel as acts of aggression aimed at eliminating the present National Authority, the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, and at stamping out once and for the aspirations of the Palestinians.

Today the international community as a whole, including the Arab States, has expressed its anger and surprise at the Israeli violence, as well as its profound concern at the grave situation prevailing in the Middle East, which is continuing to deteriorate.

Israel should stop immediately such barbaric military acts of aggression, which are destroying the peace and stability of the region. It should withdraw its forces of aggression from the autonomous regions of Palestine, including the West Bank, and immediately move towards peace negotiations with the Palestinian side, as unanimously demanded by the international community.

The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea wishes to take this opportunity to express its unqualified support for, and solidarity with, the just cause of the Palestinian people in the defence of their legitimate national rights, and with the struggle of other Arab peoples to achieve an equitable solution to the Middle East question, centred on the Palestinian issue.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea will continue in future — as it has in the past — to direct the Assembly's attention to the peaceful solution of regional conflicts and to the elimination of interference of all kinds in internal affairs and of unjust pressure.

Mr. Serbini (Brunei Darussalam): My delegation wishes to express its appreciation to the Sudan and to South Africa which, on behalf of the members of the Arab League, and of the Non-Aligned Movement, respectively, called for the timely convening of this emergency special session to consider "Illegal Israeli actions in Occupied East Jerusalem and the rest of the Occupied Palestinian Territory."

We are very concerned at the worsening humanitarian situation in the occupied territories due to the excessive use of force, leading to the continued loss of innocent lives and to the destruction of public property, as a result of military actions.

Brunei Darussalam supports all efforts to try to mediate the crisis, including those by the "quartet" and by Saudi Crown Prince Abdullah, as well as other key players in the region. We note that there have been some positive developments, including the outcome of the Arab Summit in Beirut a few months ago; the adoption of Security Council resolution 1397 (2002); the efforts by the quartet; and, more recently, the announcement of an international peace conference, to be held this summer. However, new obstacles appear, and old ones remain. The continued delays and the slow pace of progress had been disappointing. We need to further strengthen our resolve; failure to do so would mean jeopardizing the lives of innocent civilians.

The tremendous task before us is to restore and to build a climate of trust between the two sides. We call on all parties to exercise maximum restraint and to end all violence. We would also urge the resumption of dialogue as a basis for a peaceful, just and lasting settlement. In this regard, we support the role of President Arafat as the leader of, and the interlocutor for, the Palestinians.

At this juncture, we would like to stress the importance of the role of the United Nations, and in particular that of the Council — the body that is charged with the maintenance of international peace and stability — to assume its responsibilities towards all aspects of the Middle East problem until a comprehensive resolution of the problem is achieved.

It is discouraging to see the Israeli authorities continuing to defy Security Council resolutions. We therefore urge the immediate implementation of relevant resolutions, including those recently adopted by the Council, namely 1402 (2002), 1403 (2002) and 1405 (2002). We are dismayed at the fact that the United Nations fact-finding mission to Jenin was unable to fulfil its task.

Brunei Darussalam believes that a lasting peace in the Middle East will be possible only on the basis of a comprehensive settlement of the question in accordance with resolutions 242 (1967), 338 (1973) and 1397 (2002). The realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and the withdrawal of Israel from the occupied Palestinian territories, including the dismantling of illegal settlements, are essential for any meaningful progress.

In conclusion, the issue before us warrants our urgent and utmost attention. We must not let the obstacles to the peace process hamper our efforts. The lengthy suffering of the Palestinian people should come to an end. In this regard, we would like to call on the relevant parties to get back on track with a view to peaceful negotiations. We remain steadfast in supporting all efforts towards this end.

Mr. Kasoulides (Cyprus): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Cyprus Government. We also align ourselves with the statement to be delivered by Spain on behalf of the European Union.

It is with a sense of sadness that I am addressing this emergency special session, since it is a clear indication that the Security Council has not been able to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and that darkness and despair continue t prevail in the Middle East. This ongoing vicious circle of conflict has inflicted immeasurable suffering on millions of people and has created an almost permanent situation of instability, whose repercussions extend far beyond the region of the Middle East. Cyprus, a neighbouring State with longstanding and strong bonds of friendship with the people of Palestine and of Israel, is particularly pained by this seemingly never-ending cycle of violence that has tormented the two peoples over the years.

We had hoped that the constant consultations of the Security Council and the resolute international initiatives, such as the "quartet" of special envoys and the Saudi Arabian peace initiative, would contain all of the components for a lasting settlement to the Middle East conflict.

The most important lesson that can be drawn from the recent upsurge of violence in this conflict concerns the impact of security concerns on the peace process, and also the realization of the irrefutable fact that, without political negotiations offering the prospect of an end to the unacceptable situation of occupation and of the creation of a viable, independent Palestinian state, prospects for a secure Middle East remain dim and distant.

Cyprus' long-held position on the solution of the question of Palestine has been consistent and in line with international law. We strongly support the immediate implementation of resolutions 1397 (2002), 1402 (2002), 1403 (2002) and 1405 (2002) of the Security Council and their non-selective and comprehensive implementation. Furthermore, we fully support the efforts of the "quartet" and followed with some optimism its recent meeting in Washington, D.C., and its efforts to convene a peace conference on the Middle East.

We urge Israel to withdraw from the areas occupied by its troops; to desist from such actions as extrajudicial executions; to cease its incursions into the Palestinian territories, which are a clear violation of international law; and to fully respect international humanitarian law and the Geneva Conventions. The destruction of and unprecedented damage to Palestinian infrastructure in the space of a few weeks has turned the clock back years, if not generations, and has created untold suffering and destitution. That is why we urge Israel to accept the proposal of the Secretary-General for the establishment of an international force for the Middle East with extended powers to reflect the new situation on the ground. We further call for respect for and protection of all religious sites. Equally, we condemn unequivocally any form of terrorism and suicide bombing, for which we find no justification, and urge an immediate end to this practice.

We express full sympathy for President Yasser Arafat, who is the legitimate leader and elected representative of the Palestinian people, with a vital role to play in the peace process. The resolution of the situation at the headquarters of the Palestinian Authority in Ramallah and the end to his isolation were a modest start, but he should be accorded the respectability of his position and allowed to represent his people with dignity and in full freedom. The siege of the Church of Nativity should also cease immediately. We welcome the positive developments on this issue.

We reiterate our support for a just and lasting settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict based on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338

(1973). The occupation of Arab lands and the plight of the Palestinian people must come to an end, ensuring the fulfilment of their legitimate rights, including their right to an independent State. The solution of the Middle East problem will bring stability to that sensitive region of the world, ensure normal relations and the safety and security of Israel, and put an end to violence, strengthening the forces of moderation and cooperation.

Cyprus welcomed with relief the Secretary-General's initiative to create a fact-finding team to gather accurate information regarding the events in Jenin and profoundly regrets the Israeli objections that forced the Secretary-General to disband the team. This eroded the credibility and authority of the Security Council and does not allow for catharsis and reconciliation.

The ultimate challenge for the parties to this conflict is to find the necessary political courage and to go beyond hatred to look for ways to achieve piece. The international community should also stay engaged and pursue the appropriate means, as warranted by the situation and the behaviour of the parties, to put an end to the bloodshed and to return to the negotiating table. History will judge harshly both parties directly concerned, as well as all of us, if we fail to act and if we fail to act now.

Mr. Leslie (Belize): The recent events in the Middle East are the reason for our gathering here today to discuss a situation that has seen the escalation of violence, causing much pain and unnecessary loss of life, including those of innocent and defenceless men, women and, most regrettably, children.

We firmly believe that engaging in peaceful negotiations is the only viable way to put an end to the violence and to bring about meaningful peace. To sincerely engage in peaceful negotiations means respecting and abiding by all Security Council resolutions, most importantly resolution 242 (1967), which calls for the immediate withdrawal by the Israeli armed forces from the occupied Palestinian territories. The decision to ignore the good intentions of the international community is a mistake and ignores our global responsibility as partners for peace.

We are also concerned over Israel's reluctance to allow a fact-finding mission to go to Jenin. We have heard many accounts of alleged violations of international humanitarian law. To allow the United Nations to send a fact-finding mission would have been beneficial to both parties.

The General Assembly must support the efforts of the Security Council to express its dissatisfaction with the decision of the Israeli Government not to respect the wishes of the international community. We call on all parties to put an end to all acts of terrorism and we call for a complete ceasefire and withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from all Palestinian territories, including Bethlehem. We fully support the proposal of Secretary-General Kofi Annan to deploy a multinational force to ensure peace within the region. We welcome the decision by Israel to free President Arafat and now await its response towards continuing the peace talks, which we believe is the only way to end the violence and to restore peace in the Middle East.

We strongly support the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people and the emergence of a democratic Palestinian State, secure within recognized borders and committed to peaceful coexistence with Israel.

Mr. Manalo (Philippines): Recent days have offered a glimmer of hope for the Middle East situation. The lifting of the Ramallah siege and the positive developments in the Church of the Nativity stand-off are noted in this regard. We also welcome the peace conference proposed for this summer on the Israeli-Palestinian situation. However, we believe that its objectives and parameters must be carefully worked out in advance. The political conditions under which it takes place are equally important. A conference that fails to address key underlying issues may only lead to further instability, further cycles of violence and loss of innocent civilian lives.

We regret however, that Security Council resolution 1405 (2002) cannot be implemented and that the Secretary-General has decided to disband the fact-finding team. We hope that the dissolution of the team does not mean that its objectives of securing accurate information concerning the Jenin incident cannot be achieved through other means as soon as possible and without delay.

The Secretary-General once said that, if only meetings could solve conflicts, the Middle East crisis would have been laid to rest. Sadly, however, that this is not the case. Despite over 30 Security Council consultations and meetings in recent weeks on this issue, the Middle East crisis continues, notwithstanding

some recent developments. Security Council resolutions 1397 (2002), 1402 (2002), 1403 (2002) and 1405 (2002) remain, at the very best, only partly implemented. Those resolutions must be fully implemented.

Nevertheless, the full implementation of these resolutions would only be an initial step in any process aimed at achieving a durable and lasting peace in the region. In this regard, it is clear that both sides alone cannot achieve such a peace. The sustained and robust support of the international community remains the key component of any peace process. We therefore support various international initiatives on the ground, including the efforts of the "quartet".

We also reaffirm the significance of the initiative of Crown Prince Abdullah. Its adoption at the Arab summit in Beirut suggests that it has the political backing of those most directly affected by the crisis.

On 18 April, the Secretary-General presented his proposal for a multinational force to help create a secure and calm environment to continue political and diplomatic discussions among the parties, as well as to allow delivery of much-needed humanitarian assistance in the affected areas. We support that proposal and we believe that international observers should be simultaneously deployed with the force.

My delegation remains concerned about the humanitarian conditions in the occupied territories, especially those that were recently occupied, and appeals for humanitarian assistance and for humanitarian personnel to have the necessary access to those areas. We particularly urge that unrestricted access be given to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East to allow it to assist some 600,000 refugees in the Gaza Strip. We appeal to donor countries to accord high priority to alleviating this situation.

Finally, my delegation reaffirms that there can never be a military solution to the Middle East crisis. The only road to peace is through negotiating a political settlement based on the principle of land for peace and Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973).

The Acting President: Before proceeding with the next speaker, I should like to inform members that, at the request of a number of representatives, the 17th meeting of the tenth emergency special session will be suspended after the next speaker has made his statement, and will resume after a recess of one hour. We shall proceed to take up draft resolution A/ES-10/L.9/Rev.1 upon the resumption of the meeting. I therefore appeal to all representatives to return to the General Assembly Hall by 7 p.m.

Mr. Arias (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The countries of Central and Eastern Europe associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — the associated countries Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, and the European Free Trade Association country belonging to the European Economic Area, Liechtenstein, align themselves with this statement.

We are meeting today at the resumed tenth emergency special session of the General Assembly to discuss a draft resolution. Last Friday, I had an opportunity to address the Security Council in order to express the position of the European Union on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The European Union has expressed many times its grave concern at the tragic situation in the Middle East and has condemned in the strongest terms the cycle of violence and terror that has led to the loss of innocent Palestinian and Israeli lives. The language and the logic of war must end and be replaced by dialogue and negotiation. The Palestinian Authority and the Israeli Government must prove their leadership and assume their responsibilities towards their respective peoples.

In the last few days, international diplomatic efforts have succeeded in bringing about a non-violent resolution to the situation in Ramallah and the freedom of movement of President Arafat. We welcome the peaceful solution reached today through negotiations assisted by the European Union, the United States and others to end the stand-off at the Church of the Nativity, which has lasted more than a month. That solution will help to alleviate the difficult conditions of the Palestinian civilian population living in Bethlehem, which is under military occupation.

At the meeting of the "quartet" held in Washington, D.C., on 2 May, the European Union, along with the United Nations, the United States and the Russian Federation, expressed their readiness to move towards an international peace conference this

summer on security, economic and humanitarian issues and the political way forward. We welcome this initiative and stand ready to attend and contribute actively to such a conference. In that regard, we reaffirm that a just, lasting and comprehensive solution to the conflict in the Middle East must be based on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967), 338 (1973) and 1397 (2002) and on the principles of the Madrid Conference, Oslo and subsequent agreements, as well as on Crown Prince Abdullah's peace initiative, which was supported by the Arab League.

We emphasize that peace and security for both parties can be achieved only through negotiation. It is essential that immediate and parallel advances be made towards near-term and tangible political progress, along with a series of concrete steps leading to a permanent peace. The goals are clearly set out: recognition of Israel's right to live in peace within secure boundaries guaranteed by the international community and, in particular, by Arab States, as well as recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to live in peace in a democratic, viable and independent State, thereby bringing to an end the occupation of 1967.

The European Union has also reiterated on many occasions the political plan to put an end to this conflict: full and immediate implementation of Security Council resolutions and, in particular, an end to Israeli military operations in the Palestinian territories, an immediate and meaningful ceasefire and the immediate and full withdrawal of Israeli troops from all cities and areas under the control of the Palestinian Authority.

The Palestinian Authority must immediately undertake every measure within its power to end terrorist attacks against Israelis, including suicide bombings; dismantle the terrorist infrastructure and its financing; and end incitement to violence. We expect that Chairman Arafat, as the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, will use the full weight of his political authority to demonstrate leadership, combat terror and restore calm.

Israel, despite its right to fight terrorism, must stop extrajudicial killings, lift the closures and restrictions in the territories, freeze and reverse its settlement policy and respect international law. The excessive use of force cannot be justified. The actions against medical and humanitarian institutions and personnel are absolutely unacceptable and contrary to United Nations conventions and international humanitarian law. Israel must extend its fullest cooperation to humanitarian agencies and organizations and allow their unimpeded and safe access to those populations in need. In this regard, we reaffirm the applicability of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Times of War to the occupied territories, including East Jerusalem, and call for its full respect.

The European Union is deeply concerned at the unprecedented damage caused by Israeli military operations to basic structures of the Palestinian Authority. Destruction of civil infrastructure cannot be justified on the basis of the fight against terrorism. These facilities help Palestinians in their economic, social and humanitarian development and have been financed by the international donor community. We expect that these actions will not recur.

The European Union deeply regrets that the Secretary-General was forced to disband the fact-finding team, established according to Security Council resolution 1405 (2002), due to the non-cooperation of the Government of Israel. We strongly deplore this decision of Israel. In the absence of an accurate, fair and professional account of the events, serious doubts will remain of what happened at the Jenin refugee camp. For this reason, we support the Secretary-General's efforts to collate from sources available to him accurate information in view of forming a picture of those events that is as accurate as possible.

The European Union stands ready to assist the parties in implementing their agreements. To that end, a third-party monitoring mechanism on the ground is essential to the process of restoring mutual confidence and making progress on both the political and security fronts. We stand ready to participate in such a mechanism.

In conclusion, we wish to reiterate that the European Union will continue to make a full and substantial contribution to improving the living conditions of the Palestinian people by providing humanitarian assistance and helping in the economic and institutional reconstruction of the Palestinian Authority through efforts to rebuild its infrastructure, security and governance capacity, thus strengthening the economic basis of the future State of Palestine.

The meeting was suspended at 5.55 p.m. and resumed at 8.25 p.m.

The President: We shall now proceed to consider draft resolution A/ES-10/L.9/Rev.1.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote before the voting. May I remind delegations that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. de Rivero (Peru) (*spoke in Spanish*): Before the vote, my delegation would like to reaffirm Peru's firm support for the Security Council's efforts to achieve a just, durable and definitive settlement of the conflict in the Middle East, on the basis of resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). For that reason, we consider it imperative that there be an immediate call for a ceasefire and for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied Palestinian territories, in conformity with resolutions 1402 (2002) and 1403 (2002).

For Peru, there is no military solution to this conflict. That is why all Members must give their utmost support to the steps taken by the "quartet" to put an end to the violence and to arrive at a negotiated solution.

We agree with positive elements of the draft resolution now up for consideration, such as the substantive increase in economic and humanitarian assistance to the Palestinian population and the reconstruction of the Palestinian Authority. Nevertheless, Peru will abstain on this vote, because we believe that the draft resolution continues to be unbalanced by not including a clear, categorical condemnation of the terrorist attacks committed against innocent Israeli civilians and by not calling on the Palestinian Authority to take decisive action to prevent terror.

Mr. Lancry (Israel) (*spoke in French*): This morning, when the debate opened, the Palestinian delegation condemned the suicide attacks perpetrated by Palestinian groups. Unfortunately, that type of condemnation, made verbally and with an underlying permanent ambiguity, has no practical effect. We have seen such ambiguity at work at this very time, when a European compromise text, in which a condemnation of the suicide attacks appeared for the first time, was simply rejected by the Palestinian delegation. There is a gap between the theory of condemnation of suicide attacks and the practical effect of condemnation in a resolution, which no resolution has, thus far, been able to bridge.

With regard to the Palestinian delegation's condemnation this morning of the suicide attacks, each Palestinian terrorist understands that this type of extracted condemnation is conceded for the needs of the Palestinian cause before a largely indulgent international community and that it should not disrupt in any way the pursuit of the terrorism and attacks of all kinds.

At a moment when the General Assembly is preparing to vote on and — more than likely — to adopt the draft resolution, a Palestinian suicide attack has just occurred in Israel, in a youth club in Rishon Letzion, near Tel Aviv. According to preliminary reports, 16 people have died and more than 60 have been injured. If the General Assembly adopts the draft resolution, which says not a single word about the Palestinian practice of suicide terrorist attacks, the message thus sent to the Palestinians will be unequivocal. In the resolution's adoption this evening, they will receive from the General Assembly additional international support for the continuation of their deadly terrorist activities.

I therefore make a solemn appeal to the members of the General Assembly — in particular to that region that is the bearer of conscience and responsibility and that considers that the practice of Palestinian terrorism does not constitute what others see fit to label "resistance to occupation" — not to associate themselves with the disastrous nonsense of adopting the draft resolution. If adopted by means of the routine triumphalism of the majority, the draft resolution, while demonstrating a completely distorted approach to the Israeli-Palestinian reality, would be an insult to the memory of the Israeli victims of Palestinian terrorism, including those now dying in Rishon Letzion. This draft resolution would be an indelible black mark on the activities of the General Assembly and would do irremediable damage to its vocation of defending and exemplifying international humanitarian law. If adopted against the backdrop of a still-echoing suicide attack, the draft resolution would be a flagrant certification of the Assembly's own poverty, self-administered through an untroubled ritual and undisturbed by the mutilation of human lives at this very moment.

We consider that no procedural tactics consisting of approving the resolution paragraph by paragraph could confer on it the authenticity and legitimacy it lacks. This evening, the General Assembly cannot permit itself to commit a tragic error of navigation. Instead of mistakenly seeking an imaginary massacre in Jenin, the Assembly should be compelled by the real massacre, committed this evening in Rishon Letzion, and revitalize itself through the salutary reaction of categorically rejecting the draft resolution.

Israel will not be party to any procedural tricks. We reject the resolution in all its parts.

The President: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the vote.

Members will recall that a separate vote has been requested on each paragraph of draft resolution A/ES-10/L.9/Rev.1. Are there any objections to this request?

There are none. We shall therefore proceed accordingly.

I shall now put to the vote the first preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/ES-10/L.9/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia

The first preambular paragraph was adopted by 73 votes to 4, with 49 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: I shall now put to the vote the second preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/ES-10/L.9/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Gambia, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia

The second preambular paragraph was adopted by 76 votes to 4, with 47 abstentions.

[Subsequently the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: I shall now put to the vote the third preambular paragraph of draft A/ES-10/L.9/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Gambia, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, Tuvalu, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia

The third paragraph was adopted by 73 votes to 6, with 47 abstentions.

[Subsequently the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: I shall now put to the vote the fourth preambular paragraph. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Gambia, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, Tuvalu, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia

The fourth preambular paragraph was adopted by 75 votes to 6, with 47 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: I shall now put to the vote the fifth preambular paragraph. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Gambia, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Tuvalu, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia

The fifth preambular paragraph was adopted by 74 votes to 5, with 48 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: I shall now put to the vote the sixth preambular paragraph. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Gambia, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Tuvalu, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia

The sixth preambular paragraph was adopted by 77 votes to 5, with 47 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: I shall now put to the vote the seventh preambular paragraph. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Gambia, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Tuvalu, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia

The seventh preambular paragraph was adopted by 77 votes to 5, with 46 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: I shall now put to the vote the eighth preambular paragraph. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Gambia, Georgia, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of)

Abstaining:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia

The eighth preambular paragraph was adopted by 80 votes to 3, with 46 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: I shall now put to the vote the ninth preambular paragraph. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Gambia, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia

The ninth preambular paragraph was adopted by 78 votes to 4, with 47 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Lao people's Democratic Republic informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: I shall now put to the vote the tenth preambular paragraph. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Gambia, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia

The tenth preambular paragraph was adopted by 75 votes to 4, with 50 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: I shall now put to the vote the eleventh preambular paragraph. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Gambia, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia

The eleventh preambular paragraph was adopted by 77 votes to 4, with 48 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic informed the Secretary that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: I shall now put to the vote the twelfth preambular paragraph. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Gambia, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia

The twelfth preambular paragraph was adopted by 76 votes to 4, with 49 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: I shall now put to the vote the thirteenth preambular paragraph. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Gambia, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia

The thirteenth preambular paragraph was adopted by 74 votes to 4, with 50 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: I shall now put to the vote the fourteenth preambular paragraph. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Gambia, Georgia, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, United Arab Emirates,

United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of)

Abstaining:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia

The fourteenth preambular paragraph was adopted by 82 votes to 3, with 44 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Gambia, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Tuvalu, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia

Operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 73 votes to 5, with 52 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 2. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Gambia, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen

Against:

Dominican Republic, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia

Operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 75 votes to 6, with 49 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 3. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Gambia, Georgia, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of)

Abstaining:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia

Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 78 votes to 3, with 48 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 4. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico,

Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia

Against:

Israel

Abstaining:

Nauru, Peru, Rwanda, Samoa, Tonga, Tuvalu

Operative paragraph 4 was adopted by 123 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 5. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Gambia, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia

Operative paragraph 5 was adopted by 74 votes to 4, with 50 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 6. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal,

Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), United States of America

Abstaining:

Australia, Peru, Rwanda, Samoa, Tonga, Tuvalu

Operative paragraph 6 was adopted by 120 votes to 4, with 6 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 7. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Gambia, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, [illegible] Venezuela, Yemen

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (F[illegible] States of), Tuvalu, United States of Amer[illegible]

Abstaining:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, [illegible] Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, D[illegible] Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, [illegible] Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, [illegible] Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, [illegible] Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, [illegible] Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, N[illegible] Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, [illegible] Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, [illegible] Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Re[illegible] Macedonia, Tonga, Ukraine, United Kin[illegible] Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugo[illegible]

Operative paragraph 7 was adopted by [illegible] to 5, with 48 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Lao [illegible] Democratic Republic informed the S[illegible] that it had intended to vote in favour.]

I shall now put to the vote operative para[illegible] A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, A[illegible] Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Ba[illegible] Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Bosni[illegible] Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, [illegible] Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verd[illegible] China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte [illegible] Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Re[illegible] Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, [illegible] Georgia, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyan[illegible] India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Repu[illegible] Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lib[illegible] Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mal[illegible] Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, [illegible] Nauru, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, [illegible] Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Re[illegible] Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian F[illegible] Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sier[illegible] Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka [illegible] Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, [illegible] and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uni[illegible]

Emirates, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of)

Abstaining:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia

Paragraph 8 was adopted by 84 votes to 3, with 44 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 9. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Gambia, Georgia, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of)

Abstaining:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia

Paragraph 9 was adopted by 84 votes to 3, with 44 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 10. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Gambia, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic,

Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of)

Abstaining:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia

Paragraph 10 was adopted by 79 votes to 3, with 48 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/ES-10/L.9/Rev.1 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Gabon, Gambia, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia

Draft resolution A/ES-10/L.9/Rev.1, as a whole, was adopted by 74 votes to 4, with 54 abstentions (resolution ES-10/10).

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: Before giving the floor to speakers in explanation of vote after the voting, may I remind delegation that statements in explanation of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. Duval (Canada) (*spoke in French*): Canadians are appalled at the senseless terrorist attack in Rishon Lezion. There can be no justification for such an act, which will only serve to strengthen the enemies of peace, justice and truth and to damage efforts at finding a peaceful solution. Canadians extend their condolences to the victims and their families.

Moreover, we object to voting paragraph by paragraph on a resolution on a subject as important as the one that has brought us here today. A resolution should be balanced in every respect, and this draft resolution did not seem balanced to us. It is for that reason that we abstained from voting on the entire text, except for operative paragraphs 4 and 6.

(*spoke in English*)

The Government of Canada has consistently supported the Secretary-General's initiative to develop accurate information surrounding the events in Jenin. We believe that it is in Israel's own interests for those facts to be brought to light. We have also declared our profound regret at the Israeli decision not to implement Security Council resolution 1405 (2002) by receiving the fact-finding team set up to perform that function. Moreover, Israel has not yet fully withdrawn from cities in the West Bank, as called upon to do in Council resolution 1402 (2002). We remain concerned by continuing incursions into Palestinian-controlled areas. The consequence of Israel's refusal to fully and immediately implement these important resolutions has, unfortunately, extended beyond the tragedy of the conflict in the Middle East to compromise the authority of the Security Council itself.

Despite these concerns, which we have already registered, including directly with the Government of Israel, my delegation abstained on the resolution before us today. We abstained because the resolution fails to deal adequately with the full balance of responsibility for the chain of events that has led to the situation that confronts us today. This, in our view, is a fundamental weakness. Canada cannot concur with the interpretation of those events provided by the text of the resolution, nor with the singling out of one party.

The Government of Israel and the Palestinian Authority must resume discussions and cooperation urgently. Peace talks require partners who can speak for their people. Israel must re-engage with the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, that is to say, the Palestinian Authority. At the same time, we call on Chairman Arafat to use his authority not only to condemn but also to prevent all violence and to bring to justice those responsible for terrorist attacks against innocent civilians such as the one we witnessed today.

Finally, the international community ardently desires a resumption of dialogue and negotiation. It stands ready to assist the parties. The parties must make use of that good will. I would like to reiterate here Canada's willingness to assist in those efforts.

Mr. Fadaifard (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/ES-10/L.9/Rev.1 as a whole, on which the General Assembly has just taken action. However, I would like to place on record my delegation's reservation with regard to any reference in the resolution that may undermine the right of the Palestinian people to resist foreign occupation.

Mr. Stuart (Australia): Australians will also be deeply disturbed by the latest attack in this sad saga.

My delegation has abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/ES-10/L.9/Rev.1 as a whole, and on the vote on each of its preambular and operative paragraphs. We abstained on the resolution as a whole for the reasons we gave in our statement in the course of the debate. We abstained in the voting on the paragraphs, with one exception only, largely because of our concerns about the way we have proceeded in our meeting today — in particular our concerns about the lack opportunity for proper consultation with our capital on a matter of great importance. I stress that we in the Australian delegation — and, I suspect, many others — had not anticipated nor had any reason to anticipate, when we agreed to the waiver of the relevant rules of procedure as an exceptional measure, that we would then be asked to vote on each and every paragraph of this proposition.

The situation in the Middle East is one of serious concern to the Australian Government and people. Given the importance of these issues, my delegation finds it impossible to take a position on each individual paragraph in this important resolution without the opportunity to put these before our Government. We made one exception, which was to vote in favour of operative paragraph 4, and we decided to do that to join others in expressing our support for Security Council resolution 1402 (2002) and the Council's efforts on this issue.

I will just end on a note of exasperation. These are important matters. We should not be taking action on matters which, for many of us, we are having to confront at 10 or 15 minutes' or half an hour's notice. We have rules of procedure for a good reason and I very much hope that, in considering such matters in future, we can find a way of working whereby we can proceed in a better way.

The President: I call on the representative of Spain, who will speak on behalf of the European Union.

Mr. Arias (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): The European Union strongly condemns the terrorist attack

that took place today in Israel, just as, in recent weeks, we have condemned Israel's military operations in Palestinian territories, with their high number of victims and widespread destruction.

The European Union is dismayed by this apparently endless cycle of terror and violence. We strongly deplore the refusal of the Government of Israel to cooperate with the fact-finding team established in accordance with Security Council resolution 1405 (2002). From the outset, we have supported the efforts and initiative of the Secretary-General and we regret the fact that they have yet to produce results. We believe that serious doubts will persist over the events in the Jenin refugee camp in the absence of a precise and professional account of the sort proposed by the Secretary-General. In that respect, we fully support the Secretary-General's efforts to report on these events with accuracy on the basis of available sources.

From the outset, we have expressed our conviction that any resolution before this emergency special session must clearly focus on the request for a report from the Secretary-General on these events. For procedural reasons with which we do not entirely agree, we were compelled — except in the cases of operative paragraphs 4 and 6 — to abstain in the voting on the rest of the resolution.

Mr. Loizaga (Paraguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation abstained in the voting on the resolution as a whole, taking into account certain concerns over the paragraphs that were submitted for our consideration, because we feel that it is not balanced with respect to the allocation of responsibility for the facts attributed to the parties involved and does not explicitly condemn acts of terrorism.

On many occasions, the Government of Paraguay has condemned the use of terrorism as a means for achieving political ends. While the resolution condemns "acts of violence and terror", we assert that the word "terror" does not have the same meaning or scope as the word "terrorism" and that the two cannot be used synonymously in the deplorable circumstances in which the escalation of violence in the zone has led to an interminable cycle of reprisals.

Finally, the Government of Paraguay urges Israel to comply with the resolutions recently adopted by the Security Council and to cooperate with the efforts being made by the international community to achieve a just and lasting solution to the conflict.

Mr. Rosenthal (Guatemala) (*spoke in Spanish*): Although we are very distant from the events under consideration, we feel very close to the two peoples confronting each other in a long and painful conflict, with tragic consequences for all parties. Our pain arises both out of human solidarity and because our land is home to descendants of both peoples, who have lived in friendship for decades.

Specifically, our abstention in the voting is explained by the fact that, in our opinion, the text of the resolution does not sufficiently stress the perverse dynamic created by terrorist attacks that lead to reprisals, which in turn encourage further acts of terrorism, and so on. This spiral of violence does not admit of one-sided explanations or accusations against one party alone. In order to break it, we would have preferred a more balanced approach reflecting the complex reality that, as we learned only a few hours ago, continues to claim innocent lives.

We agree with many of the concepts referred to in the background of the text. Like the vast majority of the members of the General Assembly, we share the vision of two neighbouring States living in peace, harmony and security. We deplore equally the terrorist acts that have claimed many innocent lives in Israel and Israel's disproportionate military incursion into the occupied territories. We express our solidarity with all the victims of this spiral of violence and call for humanitarian assistance for the population of the zones affected by the conflict. Above all, we fully identify with Security Council resolutions 1397 (2002), 1402 (2002), 1403 (2002) and 1405 (2002) and regret the fact that the latter resolution has not been implemented.

For all of these reasons, we chose, as I have said, to abstain in the voting on this occasion.

Mr. Lavrov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian delegation voted in favour of resolution ES/10/10 and of its individual paragraphs because they are all based on decisions previously adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly, which include the clear condemnation of all forms of violence and terror without exception; the need for compliance with international humanitarian law and with United Nations resolutions on a Middle East settlement; support for the efforts of the "quartet" of international facilitators to find ways to establish a

comprehensive and just peace in the region; and the appeal for unhindered access for humanitarian assistance to the suffering civilian population.

I should like to reiterate once again that there is nothing in the draft resolution that has not been contained in previous resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly. To vote other than in favour of it would be to call into question those decisions of the United Nations.

We have heard that the outcome of today's meeting of the tenth emergency special session of the General Assembly will prompt more active efforts to put a speedy end to the cycle of violence in the Palestinian territories and to create conditions conducive to holding a conference on the Middle East. The "quartet" of international mediators stated its support for that at its recent meeting in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Valdés (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of the following countries: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Panama, Uruguay, Venezuela and Chile. We considered it opportune to explain that our support for the resolution just adopted should be seen as a sign of disapproval of the obstinate disrespect of one of the parties towards Security Council resolutions, which are not optional. We firmly believe that that diminishes the credibility and effectiveness of the work of the United Nations in its role as a guarantor of international peace and security.

Nevertheless, we would have wished for a text that explicitly mentioned the acts of suicide involving bombs and other expressions of terrorism, which we have condemned in many forums, particularly at a time when we are witnessing a new and horrible attack on the outskirts of Tel Aviv, with the loss of many innocent lives. To Israel and the victims, we express our deepest condolences. The cycle of violence engenders more violence. We should like earnestly to urge the parties once again to make way for negotiations in the search for a just and durable peace.

Mr. Satoh (Japan): The Government of Japan considers it important to develop, through objective means, accurate information with regard to recent events in the Jenin refugee camp, and therefore deplores the fact that the fact-finding team had to be disbanded. We also consider it important that both parties put an end to the vicious cycle of violence and return to the negotiating table. The Government of Japan has been urging both parties to work for the early realization of a ceasefire, as required in Security Council resolution 1402 (2002).

The draft resolution has been revised, based on the concerns expressed by some Members, and we believe that the text has been improved. However, we abstained from most of the paragraph-by-paragraph voting for procedural reasons. Draft resolutions are drafted to achieve a careful balance, and we believe that a paragraph-by-paragraph vote would not be appropriate. We are also of the view that adoption of the current draft resolution as a whole — which questions mostly the actions of one party to the conflict — would not be expected to be conducive to the attainment of a constructive settlement of the issue. We therefore abstained from voting.

The President: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote after the voting.

I now give the floor to the Permanent Observer of Palestine.

Mr. Al-Kidwa (Palestine) (*spoke in Arabic*): First of all, I should like to thank you, Mr. President, for your performance over the course of this long day. By the same token, I should like to thank the representatives of Member States who took the floor during the resumed tenth emergency special session, expressing a clear-cut position on the matters at hand, namely, the actions committed by the occupying Israeli forces against our people and against the Palestinian Authority — in particular since 29 March — and the position of Israel, the occupying Power, with regard to Security Council resolutions — including resolution 1405 (2002) — which led the Secretary-General to disband the fact-finding team.

We believe that the number of speakers and the content of their statements sent a clear message on behalf of the international community condemning Israeli practices and policies. The speakers also stressed the need to change such policies and practices so that we can put an end to this unfolding tragedy and return to the path of peace.

Frankly speaking, we did not expect the results we have achieved, for two reasons. First, the alarming and horrendous situation on the ground was expected to compel some of our friends to uphold clear-cut positions. Regrettably, it seems that the pressures

applied have been greater than their desire or ability to adopt just positions. Secondly, in good faith, we entered a long process of negotiation with many groups. In fact, we arrived at an agreement with some of them. They are committed to the agreement, and we appreciate that. We also negotiated for a long time with the European Union. We looked at all the proposals they presented with an open mind, and we altered greatly our draft resolution, believing that we had reached an understanding on that score.

All of that led to an unusual and strange situation. Suddenly, we were given an alternative draft resolution — not in the form of amendments to our draft resolution, but rather in the form of a totally new, alternative draft resolution, which came with a lower ceiling and at a later stage.

We had hoped that such proposals in the draft resolution would have been presented by the European States in the Security Council last week. What happened in the Council was different. I do not need to return to it now. However, it is probably not too late if our friends in the European Union are enthusiastic about an independent viewpoint of their own. In any case, we very much hope — in fact, we pray — that no attempt to create in the General Assembly a situation similar to that in the Security Council will succeed. The Assembly belongs to the weak — the smaller States of the Third World — and we hope it will continue to be democratic.

Insincere statements were made about the Palestinian position with regard to the suicide bombings and about Palestine's rejecting the introduction of any paragraphs to the draft resolution. I would like to state clearly that that is incorrect. It never happened. The States of the European Union proposed these paragraphs. In fact, paragraph 3 was placed in the operative portion of the draft resolution because of a proposal submitted by the Rio Group. That paragraph had essentially been in the preambular section. It is not at all correct to say that a new draft resolution was submitted as a result.

Moments ago, the representative of Israel spoke words that I believe to be indecent. Such words once again reflect Israel's aggressive attitude and its attempts to frighten others; they also reflect the sort of arrogance that befits the occupying Power. Only such a Power can offend Member States and accuse them of dependency when it speaks of an automatic majority that adopts positions without thinking.

We believe that the representatives of the occupying Power — which is the only occupying Power in the world, the only colonial phenomenon in the twenty-first century and the State whose army has committed war crimes in the past few weeks — are not entitled to give lessons to anyone, especially to the Member States of the United Nations. Perhaps they should be ashamed of the practices that they have carried out for many long years.

Perhaps the most important thing about today's voting was that Israel once again voted alone, except for the automatic support of the United States and, regrettably, the support of Micronesia and the Marshall Islands as well.

Finally, I should like to express our gratitude and profound thanks to all the Member States that voted in favour of the draft resolution in spite of everything. That is a triumph for truth, justice, international law and the ideals to which we all aspire.

The President: The tenth emergency special session of the General Assembly is now adjourned in accordance with the terms of paragraph 10 of the resolution just adopted.

The meeting rose at 9.40 p.m.